The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CIX, No. 1 January, 1944

CONTENTS

The Statement of the Board of Trustees 1
The Founding of the Catholic University of America ..... *Peter Guilday* 2
Cardinal Newman and the Lay Apostolate ..... *Edmond Darvil Benard* 17
Quietism ..... *Pascal P. Parente* 24
The Circumcision ..... *Raymond F. Stoll* 31
Preaching and the Young Priest ..... *John A. Cotter, S.J.* 43
The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 48

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Written Petitions 58
Cooperation in Abortion 58
The Crucifix and the Ostensorium on the Altar 59
Dispositions of Penitent 61
Holy Communion in a Hospital 61

ANALECTA

On the Prohibition of Books 63
Benefices Reserved to the Holy See 64
The case of the Venerable Servant of God, Catherine Tekakwitha 64
The Case of the Servant of God, Pope Pius X 66
Recent Pontifical Appointments 67

BOOK REVIEWS

Action This Day, *by Archbishop Spellman* 68
The Creed Explained, *by Joseph J. Baierl* 69
Life with the Holy Ghost, *by Hugh Francis Blunt* 70
The Apostle, *by Sholem Asch* 70
The Historic Mission of Jesus, *by C. J. Cadoux* 71
Saint Vincent Ferrier, *by Henri Ghéon* 73
Archeology and the Religion of Israel, *by William Foxwell Albright* 74
Pius XII on World Problems, *by James W. Naughton, S.J.* 74
Catholic Pittsburgh's One Hundred Years 75
BOOK NOTES 76
BOOKS RECEIVED 78

Unfailing Reverence . . .

Unrivaled Craftsmanship . . .

for 88 Years!

SINCE 1855 Will & Baumer have had the reputation of producing the finest Church Candles. For 88 years these outward symbols of Faith and Devotion have never varied in their unsurpassed craftsmanship, and in the purity of their ingredients. Every artisan at Will & Baumer has been inspired by scrupulous deference to the rubrics of the Church . . . always conscious of the high purpose for which these fine beeswax Candles are intended. The approval which their efforts have won among the clergy is a constant responsibility and inspiration to maintain this esteemed tradition.

WILL & BAUMER CANDLE CO., INC.

Established 1855

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

The Pioneer Church Candle Manufacturers of America

New York	Boston	Chicago	Los Angeles	Montreal
15 E. 32nd St.	71 Broad St.	162 N. Franklin St.	954 S. Flower St.	472 Notre Dame St. E.

ANNOUNCEMENT

With this issue, the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proceeds from its new editorial and business headquarters at The Catholic University of America. Since the passing of the scholarly and beloved founder, Monsignor Heuser, in 1933, its editors have been associated with the University, and with the exception of the past few years have been in actual residence there. For the purpose of legal organization, the Review was incorporated, according to the wishes of Monsignor Heuser, with its controls vested in a Board of Trustees. The business management was centered for many years in the office at 1722 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

Since the death of the veteran manager and counsellor of the REVIEW, Mr. Edward J. Galbally, in 1942, the Board of Trustees has been faced with earnest consideration of the various questions which have arisen, of a practical nature, in the effective continuation of the authentic traditions and standards of the Review according to the mind of its founder. As a result, it has been deemed now timely and appropriate, not only to place editorial management in the School of Sacred Theology of the Catholic University of America, but also to center the business office of the Review at the University, in the interests of coordinated management and controls. It should be noted that publications of the Dolphin Press, which is an entity distinct from the American Ecclesiastical Review, will no longer be issued from the office of the Review but from their own designated address.

It is hoped that the Review may continue, in the fullest sense, to hold the affection of the American clergy and its many friends abroad, gained over a period of almost fifty years, that it may continue to serve in ever increasing degree their spiritual, scholarly, and pastoral needs and aspirations, and in this purpose to enlist in ever expanding measure the best available talent for its contributors, old and new.

The Board of Trustees,
The American Ecclesiastical Review

THE FOUNDING OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

"At no time in the history of these United States of America has the Catholic Church taken so important and decisive a step, an action so far reaching in its effects upon the religious future of our Country, as did the assembled prelates of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore when they decreed the foundation of the Catholic University of America." The University was approaching its fifteenth anniversary when Bishop Maes of Covington, for a score of years secretary to the Board of Trustees, penned this tribute.[1] He had vigorously advocated the establishment of the University in the Council of 1884, and may therefore be considered one of its founders.

Unlike those venerable seats of learning, Harvard and Yale, the Catholic University of America has never honored the name of any one of the prelates of 1884 with the sole title of Founder. In reality, among those present at the Council, there were several bishops who had previously taken a prominent share in promoting the idea of a national Catholic center of higher learning and so deserve the name: Bishop Thomas A. Becker, then of the Diocese of Wilmington, Delaware; Bishop Richard Gilmour of Cleveland; Bishop John Ireland of St. Paul; Bishop John L. Spalding of Peoria; Bishop Maes of Covington; and the eloquent Bishop of Richmond, John Joseph Keane, who was to become the first Rector of the new institution. The idea of the University, however, was much older than the assembly of 1884; much older in fact than the Second Plenary Council of 1866, where the wish was publicly expressed by our hierarchy that such a seat of higher culture might soon be established. We had by that year (1866) become somewhat accustomed to the word "University" in Catholic educational circles, since St. Mary's College in Baltimore had been raised to University rank by the Maryland Legislature in 1805, Georgetown College had been given the same title by Congress in 1815, St. Louis University by an act of the Missouri Legislature in 1833, Notre Dame in 1844, and the University of St. Mary of the Lake which was opened that same year in Chicago. These institutions were not at that time fully equipped graduate schools as we understand the

[1] Camillus P. Maes, "The Catholic University of America," *Ecclesiastical Review*, xxix (1903), p. 570.

university of today; but they are proofs of the fact that the idea of advanced study was not neglected by Catholic educators. Bishop Becker was, in fact, to write ten years afterwards: "There had been established up to 1875, seventy-four *colleges* distinctively Catholic, chartered and conferring degrees. There is not *today*, in the entire country, a single institution, Catholic, Protestant (of any shade) or non-descript, entitled to the name of *university* in the European sense," even though, he added, they have a legal right to the name.[2]

It may interest the reader to know that as early as 1819, Father Robert Browne, O.S.A., then stationed in Charleston, S. C., in a long report to Cardinal Fontana, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, on the general conditions of Catholic life here, urged the establishment of a National Catholic University at Washington, D. C. He recommended that the District of Columbia be erected into a diocese and that the Rector of the University be made its Ordinary with power also to act as papal nuncio to the American Government. For the support of the University he suggested an annual collection to be taken up in all the parishes of the country. To supply competent clerical students, a national seminary should be established alongside the University.[3]

Considerable interest had been aroused among American Catholics of Irish blood by the decision of the Irish hierarchy to create the National Catholic University of Ireland in 1850. Two Irish priests, sent here by its first Rector, the future Cardinal Newman, were welcomed by our bishops and were permitted to collect money for the university. They were successful, and incidentally they kept alive the idea of a school of advanced studies in this country.[4] Occasional references to the necessity of an American Catholic University occur in our leading periodical of the day—*The Metropolitan* of Baltimore—during the years of 1842 to 1849, but no official statement was made until the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866. Chapter III of the ninth section of its *Acta et Decreta* is headed "De Universitate Literarum Fundanda," and the wish is expressed to see such an institution founded in the United States, but the prelates realized the finan-

[2] "Shall we have a University?", *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, i (1876), p. 235. Italics as found.

[3] Cf. Peter Guilday, *Life and Times of John England* (New York, 1927), i, pp. 288–89.

[4] Cf. James MacCaffrey, *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century: 1789–1908* (Dublin, 1910), ii, p. 242. The amount collected was $80,000.

cial difficulty involved and postponed taking any deliberate action in the matter.[5]

Between the years separating the Second and Third Plenary Councils (1866–1884), the idea of a national Catholic University was discussed at great length in the leading Catholic periodicals of the day—the *Catholic World* of New York and the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* of Philadelphia, as well as in the Catholic newspapers of the time. In one article written in 1871, presumably by Father Hecker, "On Higher Education," we find the first formal definition of the new University:

> A university is a corporation of learned and studious men who are devoted to the acquisition and communication of science and art in all their higher branches.

The writer deals with the methods of creating such a group and then ends on an optimistic note: "So far as we can see, every reason and consideration cries out imperatively for the speedy foundation of a Catholic University in the United States."[6] However, the first writer to take up the problem of the University from every conceivable angle was Bishop Becker. In a remarkably scholarly review of Newman's *Office and Work of Universities*, printed in the first volume of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* under the title "Shall we have a University?"[7], the bishop describes in detail the intellectual forces within and without the Church here which demanded a central house of higher studies for Catholics. He discusses its necessity, its feasibility, its establishment, its professors and students, and its "beneficial results to the Church and to our country." His treatment reveals the fact that the project by that time had not met with unanimous support among American Catholics. The three chief objections—money, capable professors and competent students—were being generally canvassed in the Catholic newspapers, a discussion that was later taken up by the non-Catholic press. Of the first problem, that of finances,

[5] "Atque utinam in hac regione Collegium unum maximum, sive Universitatem habere liceret, quod Collegiorum horum omnium, sive domesticorum sive exterorum, commoda atque utilitates complecteretur; in quo, scilicet, literae et scientiae omnes, tam sacrae quam profanae, traderentur! Utrum vero Universitatis hujusmodi constituendae tempus advenerit, necne, Patrum judicio, rem totam maturius posthac perpendentibus, relinquimus." *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensi II, Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore, 1868), p. 228.

[6] *Catholic World*, xiii (1871), p. 124.

[7] Vol. i (1876), pp. 235–253.

Bishop Becker was certain that the pecuniary means necessary for the purpose could be obtained. It would depend, he writes, "entirely on that faith and benevolence among Catholics, for which they have been in all ages and countries remarkable;" and he saw no reason to fear that American Catholics would fail to coöperate in the project. In this he was not mistaken, for no Catholic institution in the land up to that time ever began with so splendid an endowment. His delineation of the ideal Catholic University professor is in keeping with his own straight-forward, if somewhat blunt, character. He is more anxious about the type of professor the University should not have; and in rebuttal to the objection that foreigners might be asked to take chairs, he says:

> Should we ever find ourselves obliged to import from Europe our first professors of some few branches, we have yet to learn that science is of any special country. It is generally admitted that Harvard College did an honorable thing for herself, and reflected credit upon our common country, when she secured the services of an Agassiz; and Princeton is justly applauded for giving to our country the high benefits of the educational skill of McCosh.[8]

To the bishop the chief difficulty was a competent group of students—"a sufficient number of young men, whose preparation has been of such a nature, and whose attainments are such, as to enable them to profit by the grade of instruction which must be imparted in a university at all worthy of the name, and we do not advocate the establishment of any other."[9] His consideration of this part of the subject took him into the rather delicate question of the educational standards of the American Catholic colleges (and universities) of the day and he spared them nothing in the way of criticism in order to prove his thesis—that a central university was necessary to bring Catholic secondary education up to a more commendable level. In a second article entitled "A Plan for the Proposed University"[10] Bishop Becker replies to the critics who attacked his first paper. The article is too long even for a short analysis here. He describes four Faculties —theology, law, medicine, literature or academic studies, with five professors for divinity, three for law, four for medicine and fifteen for the academic studies. In addition, he writes, "provision should be

[8] *Loc. cit.*, p. 250.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] Vol. i (1876), pp. 655–679.

made for instruction in Spanish, the Scandinavian and Slavonic tongues, as soon as practicable."

The *Catholic Quarterly Review* rivalled the *Catholic World* in the ambitus of its influence, and one may not be far afield in recognizing in Bishop Becker's frank appeal for the University the beginning of the determination on the part of our hierarchy to create the institution This decision came to fruition in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore eight years later (1884). With the sure promise of the princely sum of three hundred thousand dollars from Miss Mary Gwendolin Caldwell, the Fathers of the Council decreed formally the foundation of the Catholic University of America. Of the four decrees on clerical education only the following need be cited:

Ita ut, seminario tali semel incepto haberetur nucleus vel germen quoddam unde, favente Dei gratia, perfecta suo tempore efflorescceret studiorum universitas.[11]

Thus, the entire hierarchy, in spite of some spirited opposition during the Council, became the Founders of the University. The outstanding proponent of the measure was Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria, who had previously been chosen to preach one of the public sermons to be given in the Baltimore cathedral during the Council (which lasted from November 8 to December 7, 1884), the subject being "De Clericorum perfectiori educatione," later printed as "University Education."[12] It is in this sermon that the first official declaration of the project was made in words that have long since become familiar, but which should be included here for historical completeness:

Let there be then an American Catholic University, where our young men, in the atmosphere of faith and purity, of high thinking and plain living, shall become more intimately conscious of the truth of their religion and of the genius of their country, where they shall learn the repose and dignity which belongs to their ancient Catholic descent, and yet not lose the fire which glows in the blood of a new people; to which from every part of the land our eyes may turn for guidance and encouragement, seeking light and self-confidence from men in whom intellectual power is not separate from

---

[11] "So that, this seminary being begun, there should be a nucleus or germ from which, God favoring, a perfect university should in time develop." Cf. *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii tertii* (Baltimore, 1886), p. 94.

[12] *The Memorial Volume—A History of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1885), pp. 75–102.

moral purpose; who look to God and His universe from bending knees of prayer; who uphold

The cause of Christ and civil liberty
As one and moving to one glorious end.

Should such an intellectual center serve no other purpose than to bring together a number of eager-hearted, truth-loving youths, what light and heat would not leap forth from the shock of mind with mind; what generous rivalries would not spring up; what intellectual sympathies, resting on the breast of faith, would not become manifest, grouping souls like atoms, to form the substance and beauty of a world.

In the thirtieth private congregation of the Council was read a letter from Miss Caldwell offering her gift for the University and the Fathers immediately appointed a committee to receive the promised donation and to take steps to secure other funds. This committee consisted of Archbishops Gibbons, Williams, Ryan, Heiss and Corrigan, Bishops Ireland and Spalding, Monsignor (later Cardinal) Farley, and Messrs. Reuben Springer, Eugene Kelly and Francis Drexel.[13] Other ecclesiastics and laymen were added to the Executive Committee which held meetings in New York and Baltimore in January, February and May, 1885. One of the chief points of discussion was the site of the new University. Seton Hall College was offered to the Committee by Bishop Wigger of Newark and there was a prospect of making St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Penna., the nucleus of the future institution. Eventually Washington was chosen, and the old Middleton manor of sixty-five acres opposite the Soldiers Home and near the suburb of Brookland was purchased. Plans were drawn for the first University building, to be named Caldwell Hall. At its meeting on October 27, 1886, letters to Pope Leo XIII and to the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, describing the action taken, were read and approved. It was also decided that Bishop Keane who had been nominated by the Board of Trustee as first Rector of the University, should go to Rome with these two letters to obtain the approval of the Holy See. In its letter to Leo XIII, the Board recommended that the University

should forever remain under the government of the Bishops of the United States, and should never pass into the control of a religious Order; that the internal discipline of the theological school be placed in the hands of the

[13] Thomas O'Gorman, "Leo XIII and the Catholic University," *Catholic University Bulletin*, i (1895), p. 19.

Society of St. Sulpice; that Washington be chosen as the site of the University; and that the first Rector be the Rt. Rev. J. J. Keane, who has consented to resign the see of Richmond to take up the difficult task of making the foundation.[14]

In the previous autumn of 1885, an *Appeal*[15] written by Bishop Spalding, was printed and sent out to wealthy Catholics. The *Appeal* makes interesting reading after all these years. For the benefit of those who wished to endow chairs, it is stated that for those chairs which priest-professors were to occupy, fifty thousand dollars would suffice, but for those to be filled by laymen one hundred thousand would be necessary. "The creation of this University," we read, "is the first work of a general and national significance undertaken by the Church in this country. . . . No system of education, indeed, can be complete which does not terminate in a university." We have no means of knowing how this *Appeal* was distributed, but the response was generous.[16]

Bishop Keane was at first rather reluctant to accept the rectorship on the score that he was not a university-trained scholar, and he urged the nomination of Bishop John Lancaster Spalding. Finally, Keane consented when he was told that Spalding had refused the post. The announcement of his appointment was not made public until the following year when the Holy See gave its approval to the project. Keane at this time was a man of forty-six. He was born in Ballyshannon, County Donegal, Ireland, the son of Hugh and Fannie Keane, whose four other children died in childhood. The family came to Baltimore in 1846 during the famine. Educated by the Christian Brothers, he spent three years in business and then entered St. Charles College, Ellicott City, Maryland. In 1862, he went to St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1866. The next twelve years were spent as curate at St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C. On August 25, 1878, he was consecrated Bishop of Richmond by Archbishop Gibbons. Keane had taken an active part in the Council of 1884 in the University project and was, there-

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[15] *An Appeal to the Catholics of the United States in behalf of the University which the late Council of Baltimore resolved to Create* (New York, 1885, pp. 24).

[16] By August, 1888, the amount subscribed in cash was almost $700,000, with another $100,000 pledged "by persons of unquestioned reliability." Cf. "Standing of the Catholic University," *Catholic World*, lvii (1888), pp. 582–583, where a list of the donors is given.

fore, considered capable of carrying it to completion. "As a young man Keane was far from robust. In spite of very poor vision which made sustained reading a severe effort, he was a man of varied and superior education. His alert mind, constant industry, remarkable powers of assimilation, philosophic temper, and broad sympathies gave him singular competence and distinction, while his charm of personality, practical charity, and spiritual concept of personal and social life gave him universal appeal."[17]

All these gifts were placed generously at the disposal of the leaders of the new intellectual movement in American Catholicism. With characteristic promptness he set out with Bishop Ireland in November, 1886, for Rome. On their arrival, they had the two letters printed, and these were represented to Leo XIII and to Cardinal Simeoni. Among those visited by the two prelates was the Jesuit theologian, Cardinal Mazzella, who gave them courage in meeting the serious objections to the University which preceded them to Rome. Mazzella, while a teacher at Georgetown College and at Woodstock College, had become an American citizen. Rome was then awaiting the coming of Archbishop Gibbons who had been made a Cardinal during the summer of 1886. After receiving the red hat on March 25, 1887, Cardinal Gibbons was of signal service to Bishops Keane and Ireland in smoothing out the difficulties which had arisen, and on April 10, 1887, Pope Leo gave his solemn approval to the University, but requested that a vote of the American bishops be taken on the question of the proposed site. Cardinal Gibbons sent a circular letter from Rome on the subject, the result being that the majority of the bishops favored Washington, and so the question was definitely settled.

In an article in the *Catholic World* for July, 1889, we learn that Bishop Keane was honored by a banquet at the American College. This, the writer states, "was an inauguration of the institution in Rome itself." Leo XIII was represented by his Vicar, Cardinal Parocchi, and two other Cardinals, Schiaffino and Bianchi, were present. Among the guests was Archbishop Jacabini, Secretary of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, an important official in American Church affairs at that time. We learn too that "Cardinal Mazzella, unable to attend, sent a letter giving his hearty suffrage to the institution as a Jesuit, a prelate, and an American."[18]

[17] William J. Kerby, in *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1933), x, p. 268.

[18] "The Catholic University and its Constitutions," xlix (1889), p. 427.

Keane left Rome shortly after receiving the papal brief of approval and visited the principal Universities on the Continent and in England in order to study their systems, and also to secure professors for the University. We have the results of this journey in a series of articles in the *Catholic World*.[19] There is no doubt that he was favorably impressed by the German universities he had visited, but the final decision was to model the Washington School upon the Catholic University of Louvain. The two scholars whose advice he prized most were the future Cardinals Mercier and Satolli. Keane returned to his diocese, Richmond, to arrange ecclesiastical affairs there in anticipation of his resigning that See. At a meeting of the Board, held in Baltimore under the chairmanship of Cardinal Gibbons on September 7, 1887, Bishop Keane made a report of all that he and Bishop Ireland had done in Rome for the University and they were tendered a vote of thanks. Bishop Keane's appointment was now officially made public and met with general approval. He spent the winter of 1887–1888 and the following spring in making collections in Baltimore, Philadelphia, Boston and Chicago, with the result that the endowments for the Chairs of the Divinity School were pledged. In this arduous, and at times unpleasant, work he was ably assisted by Bishops Spalding and Ireland.

Early in April, 1888, ground was broken and work on the building of Caldwell Hall was soon begun. The cornerstone laying was set for May 24, 1888. It is a day that has never been forgotten in Catholic University annals. "The rain poured down in torrents from first to last, but the President of the United States and in his Cabinet attended the ceremonies throughout, greeting an assemblage of Catholic prelates and ecclesiastics and representative Catholic laymen such as is never, save for the furtherance of the very highest interests of religion, brought together in any country."[20] Cardinal Gibbons presided and Bishop Spalding preached the sermon which was later printed.[21] It is one of the most learned of his addresses but it con-

[19] "The Mediaeval Universities," xlvi (1887), p. 33; "The Catholic University of Louvain," *ibid.*, p. 88; "The Roman Universities," *ibid.*, p. 313; "The University of Strasburg," *ibid.*, p. 643; "The Catholic Universities of France," xlvii (1888), p. 577.

[20] "The Present Standing of the University," *Catholic World*, xlvii (1887), p. 577. An account of the ceremonies, together with excerpts from the speeches of the President, Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec, Secretary of State Blaine and others, will be found in Will, *Life of Cardinal Gibbons* (New York, 1922), i, pp. 450–452.

[21] *An address delivered at the Laying of the Cornerstone of the Catholic University at Washington, D. C., May 24, 1888*, by J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria (Peoria, Ill., 1888, pp. 25), later incorporated into his *Education and the Higher Life* (Chicago, 1890).

tains only a passing reference to the University itself, though it does end with a fitting tribute to Mary Gwendolin Caldwell.

During July and August, 1888, while conducting a collection tour in and around Chicago, Bishop Keane spent some weeks at the University of Notre Dame, and there he composed two Constitutions for the University after studying those of the Universities of Louvain, Laval, Paris and Strasburg—one for the University in general and the other for the School of Sacred Science.[22] It was at this time that Rev. Philip J. Garrigan, of Fitchburg in the Diocese of Springfield, Mass., was chosen at first Vice-Rector of the University. Shortly after the laying of the cornerstone, Bishop Keane resigned the See of Richmond and was appointed titular Bishop of Jasso in Asia Minor.

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees in November, 1888, the two Constitutions were approved and it was resolved to ask Monsignor Corcoran, then a professor at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Penna., to translate them into Latin for presentation to the Holy See. A report of all that had been accomplished was drafted on November 13, 1888, and Bishop Keane was instructed to take it to Leo XIII. Letters were written to the Holy Father and to the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, in which the Board stated that it had accepted Cardinal Gibbons' invitation to have the solemn dedication and opening of the University during the centennial celebration of the erection of the Diocese of Baltimore, to be held a year later in November, 1889. Bishop Keane was also instructed to make final arrangements with the priests who were to become the first members of the Faculty of Divinity. Dr. Garrigan was to preside over University affairs during his absence.

A commission of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide under Cardinal Mazzella approved the Statutes which were signed on March 7, 1889—the most auspicious day in the University calendar, for it was on that day also that Pope Leo signed the Apostolic Letter of Foundation, the *Magni Nobis Gaudii*. Upon this pontifical cornerstone rests the entire structure, material and spiritual, of the University.

Bishop Keane believed that he could obtain the best ecclesiastical talent in Europe and America for his first staff of professors. In this he was not mistaken. There is a picture of this first group in the *Catholic World* for April, 1893,[23] with Bishop Keane in the center.

[22] The original manuscript is in the Memorial Hall at Notre Dame.

[23] Vol. lvii, p. 116.

Four priests are especially worthy of mention in this chronicle since they were asked by Keane to come to Washington: Henri Hyvernat, Joseph Schroeder, Joseph Pohle, and Thomas Bouquillon. All were young. Hyvernat was the youngest, being in his thirty-first year. Schroeder was forty, Pohle, thirty-seven, and Bouquillon, forty-two. All four had had the best ecclesiastical training France, Germany and Belgium could provide. The courses assigned to them were as follows:

HYVERNAT, *Professor of Scriptural Archaeology and Oriental Languages.*
SCHROEDER, *Professor of Dogmatic Theology.*
POHLE, *Professor of Christian Apologetics or the Philosophical Foundations of Religion.*
BOUQUILLON, *Professor of Fundamental Moral Theology.*[24]

Monsignor Schroeder and Dr. Pohle were later to return to Germany, Dr. Bouquillon died in Belgium in 1902 and Dr. Hyvernat has only recently passed away. Dr. Charles G. Herbermann has described for us the educational advantages of these four pioneers in an article in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*.[25] The other professors who took part in the opening courses were Father Joseph Graf, who was choir master and who gave lessons in liturgical chant, Abbé John Hogan, S.S., who directed the ecclesiastical discipline of Caldwell Hall and who lectured three times a week on Ascetical Theology, Father Orban, S.S., who was Abbé Hogan's assistant and who gave courses in geology, Mr. Bazerque, who taught French language and literature, Professor Webster Edgerly who gave classes in elocution, the Rector himself who taught Sacred Eloquence, and Charles Warren Stoddard, lecturer in English Literature, who brought national renown to the new institution. Stoddard was forty-six years old at this time and was a prominent figure in the field of American letters. He became a Catholic in 1867, and for a score of years (during which he served as secretary to Mark Twain) had written many books which were and still are considered among the best in American literature. He taught at the University of Notre Dame for a year before he joined

[24] The titles of the courses are taken from a brochure—*Solemnities of the Dedication and Opening of the Catholic University of America, November 13, 1889* (Baltimore, 1890).

[25] "The Faculty of the Catholic University," xiv (1889), pp. 701–715. Other scholars whom Keane invited to the University were the celebrated Jesuit theologian Lehmkuhl, the historian Jungmann of Louvain and Checchi, professor of moral theology in the Urban College of Propaganda.

the Catholic University staff in 1889, and remained until 1902, when he resigned to take up writing exclusively. He was "a man of great sweetness, kindliness and gentleness, with a gift of whimsical humor . . . and is said to have had a wider friendship among literary folk than any one else in his day."[26] Curiously enough, the University traditions have more about Stoddard than any one of the pioneers mentioned. "He needs no introduction to the American public," we read in Herbermann's article, "for his name has a good ring in American literature."[27]

It should be remembered here in passing that Bishop Keane had already begun to recruit others for posts in the Faculty. Before the University opened Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shahan, later to become the fourth Rector of the University, was following lectures in Berlin under Harnack in history, Rev. Dr. Edward A. Pace, for many years Vice-Rector of the University, was following the lectures of Wundt in psychology at Leipzig, Rev. Dr. Sebastian Messmer, later Archbishop of Milwaukee, was completing in Rome his studies in Canon Law, and Rev. Dr. Charles Grannan was in Paris, perfecting himself in Scriptural studies.

All was now prepared in the summer of 1889—a glorious jubilee year in the history of the American Church—for the University to inaugurate its great work.

The allusion made in the Apostolic Brief of Foundation (March 7, 1889) to the coming centennial of the first American See, that of Baltimore, must have given considerable pleasure to Cardinal Gibbons and the American hierarchy. Pope Leo XIII called the University a monument and perpetual memorial of that most auspicious event. Three celebrations were joined together—the centenary of the original Diocese of Baltimore (November 6), the First General Congress of the Catholic Laity (November 11), and the Dedication of Caldwell Hall (November 13). Almost all members of the American episcopate and distinguished ecclesiastics from all parts of the United States came to Baltimore and Washington to participate in the ceremonies.[28] The

[26] Carl G. Stroven, in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, xviii (1936), p. 52.

[27] *Loc. cit.*, p. 706.

[28] A complete account of the three celebrations was printed by William H. Hughes, *Souvenir Volume: Three Great Events in the History of the Catholic Church in the United States—The Centenary Celebration, Proceedings of the First American Catholic Congress, and Dedication of the Catholic University* (Detroit, 1889, pp. 114). Later the University printed an official report entitled *Solemnities of the Dedication and Opening of the Catholic University of America, November 13th, 1889* (Baltimore, 1890).

dedication of Caldwell Hall was carried out in a very attractive way. A choir of two hundred and fifty seminarians from St. Mary's, Baltimore, and St. Charles College, then at Ellicott City, accompanied by the Marine Band, sang the hymns and litanies, and we are told that "the effect was majestic and thrilling in the extreme." Pontifical Mass was celebrated in the presence of Cardinal Gibbons and Cardinal Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec, by Archbishop Francesco Satolli, who four years later was to become the first Apostolic Delegate to the United States. At the end of the Mass, the dedication sermon was preached by Bishop Richard Gilmour of Cleveland. Again, in his words, we find the idea of the University defined:

> The end, then, of a university is to gather within its halls the few who are brighter in intellect and keener in thought, and to expand and vivify within them knowledge; then send them forth leaders to instruct and train the masses . . . Let generosity mark the spirit of this house of learning. Let its halls be filled with the best of our youth, and let every effort be made to place this University in the front ranks of modern institutions of learning . . . Let the great ambition of this University be to lead in all that tends to elevate our race, benefit our fellow-citizens, and bless our country.

During Bishop Gilmour's sermon, the overflow audience met in the main lecture hall to listen to a sermon on "The Visibility of the Church, a Manifestation of God," by the celebrated Passionist, Father Fidelis (James Kent Stone). A banquet followed and toasts were given to Pope Leo XIII (responded to by Archbishop Satolli in Latin), to our country, and her President (responded to by Hon. James G. Blaine, Secretary of State), to our sister Universities (responded to by Cardinal Taschereau in French), to the hierarchy of the United States, to which Cardinal Gibbons replied, and a final toast "to the Press, Educator of the World," which was answered in a poem by John Boyle O'Reilly, then editor of the *Boston Pilot*. That same afternoon the guests met in the reception rooms to witness the presentation of a bust of St. Thomas Aquinas, the gift of the English-speaking Catholics of Rome. The presentation was made by Bishop John Virtue of Portsmouth, England;[29] and the illuminated address from the English, Scottish and Irish donors was read by Monsignor Gadd of the Diocese of Salford,

[29] Bishop Virtue, one of the delegates from the English hierarchy to the Centennial celebration, had visited the United States in 1853, as secretary to Archbishop Bedini. Cf. Peter Guilday, . . . "Gaetano Bedini," *Hist. Records and Studies*, xxiii (1933), pp. 87–170.

England. There followed then the reading of letters of congratulation from the Catholic Universities of Paris, Lyons, Laval, Ottawa and Louvain, as well as from the English Catholic Colleges of Oscott, Ushaw and Manchester. Cablegrams were received from the Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris and from the Rector and students of the American College in Rome. One letter has historic significance today, that from Monsignor Mercier of Louvain, who had been asked by Bishop Keane to be one of the first group of professors. The reading of joint letters from the Irish and English hierarchy brought the exercises to a close. Shortly afterwards and formal opening of the courses took place. The *Veni Sancte Spiritus* was said by Cardinal Gibbons, and Bishop Michael J. O'Farrell of Trenton delivered the inaugural oration. Bishop John L. Spalding was to have given the same, but was confined to his house with illness. This was followed by an oration in Latin by one of the four pioneer professors, Monsignor Joseph Schroeder, who had been chosen dean of the Faculty of Theology. That very evening, November 13, at 8:30 P.M., the students assembled in the University chapel to begin a spiritual retreat of four days conducted by Abbé Hogan, S.S. On Monday, November 18, Bishop Keane celebrated Mass of the Holy Ghost, and at its close the professors, kneeling before the altar, recited aloud the profession of faith and kissed the Holy Gospels as a pledge of their loyalty. The *Te Deum* was sung and then all assembled in the lecture hall to hear a discourse by Bishop Keane. The following day, November 19, lectures were begun.

Thirty-six members of the student body were priests from twenty-one archdioceses and dioceses. One was a member of the Society and St. Sulpice. Nine were Paulists, the first religious community to reside on the campus. Two other priests were expected from Detroit, and some of the clergy of Washington had expressed a desire to follow the lectures. Four Chairs had been established—The Shakespeare Caldwell Chair of Dogmatic Theology; the Elizabeth Breckenridge Caldwell Chair of Philosophy; the Andrews Chair of Scriptural Archaeology; the Francis A. Drexel Chair of Moral Theology; and the Eugene Kelly Chair of Ecclesiastical History.

It is significant that the first problem discussed by the University officers and teachers was the opening of courses for the Catholic laity. "It is a matter of deep thankfulness to Divine Providence," we read in the first official Report of the Rector, "that the means of University training for the clergy should at last have been provided, fulfilling the

wishes and prayers of those who laid in our country the foundations of the Church's prosperity. But we should be untrue to them and to the great interests in our hands, did we not hasten to give the work the extension which the welfare of Church and country imperatively demands, by placing its advantages within the reach of the laity as well. To do this as speedily as possible is the ardent desire of the authorities of the University, and of the bishops of the United States, whom they represent. The responsibility of its being accomplished must lie with those in whose hands Providence has placed the pecuniary means by which alone it can be done."

The School of the Sacred Sciences remained alone for the next six years when in 1895 two other schools were founded especially for graduate study by the laity—the School of Philosophy and the School of Social Science. The progress of the University under its first Rector, Bishop Keane, from November, 1889, until his resignation on September 29, 1896, is one of the most interesting chapters, not without its poignant episodes, in the annals of Catholic education in the United States.

Washington, D. C. PETER GUILDAY.

CARDINAL NEWMAN AND THE LAY APOSTOLATE

Mr. Newman, the Vicar of St. Mary's, was preaching on a favorite subject that June day in Oxford in the year 1843. "Let us but raise the level of religion in our hearts," he said, "and it will rise in the world. He who attempts to set up God's kingdom in his heart, furthers it in the world. He whose prayers come up for a memorial before God, opens the 'windows of heaven, and the foundations of the great deep,' and the waters rise."[1]

Four years later John Henry Newman was a Catholic and a priest; he died in 1890 a Cardinal of the Church. As a Protestant minister he labored to impress upon his congregation the duty of advancing the cause of Christianity in the world. As a Catholic priest he clearly saw that the cause of Jesus Christ on earth is the cause of the Catholic Church. The apostolate of the Catholic laity was one of his dearest interests, and his constant deep concern.

The music of Newman's voice has been stilled for half a century and more, but his thoughts have, very often, a peculiar quality of timelessness about them. His ideas on the lay apostolate are well worth recalling in this our own day, when the necessity of Catholic Action has been impressed upon both priests and laymen by the Holy See itself.

Newman had a vivid appreciation of the dignity of the Catholic laity. He recognized the importance to the prosperity of the Church of a courageous, solidly pious, adequately instructed lay body. "In all times," he wrote, "the laity have been the measure of the Catholic spirit; they saved the Irish Church three centuries ago, and they betrayed the Church in England. Our rulers were true, our people were cowards."[2] His studies of early Church history had taught him an unforgettable lesson regarding the importance of the *sensus fidelium* as an instrument of tradition. During the great heresies of the fourth century, when communication with the Holy See, source and criterion of truth, was so difficult for large sections of the body Catholic, "it was simply the living spirit of the myriads of the faithful, none of them known to fame, who received from the disciples of our

[1] *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891, p. 134

[2] *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903, pp. 390–91.

Lord, and husbanded so well, and circulated so widely, and transmitted so faithfully, generation after generation, the once delivered apostolic faith . . . ."[3] It is not surprising that Newman's tremendous respect for the laity, and his anxiety that they should be equipped as perfectly as possible to carry on their proper function in the Church, should be reflected in his writings.

Nearly five hundred sermons, either in full text or in outline form, are to be found among his published works. Almost invariably, their theme is some aspect of Christian perfection; and, for their preacher, to be a complete and perfect Christian was to bear living witness to the faith. To John Henry Newman, the apostolate for Christ was not reserved to the chosen few, nor was it an optional activity, to be pursued or neglected according to individual taste. It was a sacred obligation. Moreover, it was an obligation incumbent upon the members of the Christian laity from the very fact of their Christianity:

> This is the glory of the Church, to speak, to do, and to suffer, with that grace which Christ brought and diffused abroad. And it has run down even to the skirts of her clothing. Not the few and the conspicuous alone, but all her children, high and low, who walk worthy of her and her Divine Lord, will be shadows of Him. All of us are bound, according to our opportunities,—first to learn the truth; and moreover, we must not only know, but we must impart our knowledge. Nor only so, but next we must bear witness to the truth. We must not be afraid of the frowns or anger of the world, or mind its ridicule. If so be, we must be willing to suffer for the truth.[4]

Newman, in his sermons, put first things first. Before a Christian could play his destined role in the sanctification of the world, he must sanctify himself. He must either conquer the world in his own intimate daily life, or the world would conquer him.[5] "Till we look at home, no good shall we be able to perform for the Church at large; we shall but do mischief, when we intend good, and to us will apply that proverb—'Physician, heal thyself.' "[6] The very person of the true Christian, his mere presence among men, is an argument for Christ, and the attraction exerted by unconscious holiness is urgent and irresistable.[7] "Let us learn first to 'come' diligently 'to the waters,'

[3] *Historical Sketches*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896, Vol. I, p. 209.
[4] *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 62.
[5] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 111.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 133. Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 109; *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., Vol. VII, p. 39.
[7] Cf. *Oxford University Sermons*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896, p. 95.

and ask for that gift of God, which will be 'a well of water in us springing up unto everlasting life.' And let us not doubt that if we do thus proceed, we shall advance the cause of Christ in the world, whether we see it or not, whether we will it or not, whether the world wills it or not."[8]

Presupposing a laity well instructed in the faith and sincerely striving to live in the state of God's grace, how should they proceed in what we might call the "external activity" of the apostolate? A tentative plan of action adapted, of course, to a given set of circumstances, was outlined by Newman in a letter to a lay friend during the agitation over "Papal aggression" which followed Cardinal Wiseman's triumphant pastoral "from out the Flaminian Gate" announcing the re-establishment of the English hierarchy.

"I dare say it may be in the event advisable for our Bishops to do nothing," Newman wrote, "but for that reason, if for no other, the laity should stir.... I do think you should get a set of fellows who will devote themselves to the cause of the Church. Let it be their recreation as geology or ecclesiology might be, while it is their *work*." He suggested that such groups, "six men in London, six in Birmingham, six in Liverpool, &c.," voluntary and informal at first, but with the secret sanction of the Cardinal and Bishops, might meet and consecrate their purpose by a religious act. They would then hold public meetings in the principal towns, with the object of bringing before the laity the position of the Catholic Church in England and the method of defending it. "The public might be admitted (Catholics gratis—Protestants by tickets—or Catholics by tickets, Protestants on payment), and the meeting advertised." Gradually the groups would form into shape, and each club or association would take a Patron Saint.[9]

The plan, so far as we know, was never carried out. But Newman himself, though a priest, not a layman, decided to deliver a set of such lectures. They were addressed to an audience of Catholic laymen, the "Brothers of the Oratory," in the Corn Exchange in Birmingham during the summer of 1851, and are included in the published editions of Newman's works under the title *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*.

The Corn Exchange Lectures were, naturally, directed against the particular sort of anti-Catholic feeling prevalent in England at

[8] *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, pp. 133–34.

[9] Cf. Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, New York, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912, Vol. I, pp. 262–63.

the time of their delivery. They contain many features which are not patient of universal application. Still, Newman's general advice to the Catholics of Birmingham in 1851 is not without value for the American Catholics of 1944.

Newman devoted his first eight lectures to a brilliantly satiric survey of the popular Protestantism of the day, considered in its opposition to Catholicism. "Its truth," he summarized, "is Establishment by law; its philosophy is Theory; its faith is Prejudice; its facts are Fictions; its reasonings Fallacies; and its security is Ignorance about those whom it is opposing."[10]

In the ninth and last lecture he described the duties of Catholic laymen in a non-Catholic environment. Organization, edification, cultivation of mind, growth of the reason,—these must be their primary aims.[11] "I want a laity," he said, "not arrogant, not rash in speech, not disputatious, but men who know their religion, who enter into it, who know just where they stand, who know what they hold, and what they do not, who know their creed so well, that they can give an account of it, who know so much of history that they can defend it."[12]

He warned the laymen of Birmingham that their strength lay not in numbers, but in their God and their conscience, and in their power to exert "an august moral influence" on the world.

> Grow you must; I know it; you cannot help it; it is your destiny; it is the necessity of the Catholic name, it is the prerogative of the Apostolic heritage; but a material extension without a corresponding moral manifestation, it is almost awful to anticipate; awful, if there should be the sun of justice within you, with so little power to cast the illumination of its rays upon the multitudes without . . . . It is a moral force, not a material, which will vindicate your profession, and will secure your triumph. It is not giants who do most. How small was the Holy Land! yet it subdued the world.[13]

Not only must the Catholic begin his work at home, in the sense of cleansing and purifying his own heart; the cause of the Catholic Church must first of all be made secure by the Catholic in his own immediate environment:

> Let each stand on his own ground; let each approve himself in his own neighbourhood; if each portion is defended, the whole is secured. Take

---

[10] *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*, p. 371.
[11] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 389.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 390.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 389.

care of the pence, and the pounds will take care of themselves.... And then if troubled times come on, and the enemy rages, and his many voices go forth from one center all through England, threatening and reviling us, and muttering, in his cowardly way, about brickbats, bludgeons and lighted brands, why in that case the Birmingham people will say, "Catholics are, doubtless, an infamous sect, and not to be trusted ... but somehow an exception must certainly be made for the Catholics of Birmingham. They are not like the rest: they are indeed a shocking sect at Manchester, Preston, Blackburn, and Liverpool; but, however you account for it, they are respectable men here. Priests in general are perfect monsters; but here they are certainly unblemished in their lives, and take great pains with their people...." And in like manner, the Manchester people will say, "Oh, certainly, Popery is horrible, and must be kept down. Still, let us give the devil his due, they are a remarkably excellent body of men here, and we will take care that no one does them any harm...." And thus, my Brothers, the charges against Catholics will become a sort of Hunt-the-slipper, everywhere and nowhere, and will end in "sound and fury, signifying nothing."[14]

With their position thus solidified in each locality, Catholics would have no need of searching "on the right hand or on the left" for friends in time of storm. "Trust neither Assyria nor Egypt," Newman counseled; "trust no body of men. Fall back on yourselves, and trust none but yourselves. I do not mean you must not be grateful to individuals who are generous to you, but beware of parties; all parties are your enemies; beware of alliances. You are your own best, and sure, and sufficient friends...."[15]

In addition to his sermons, lectures, and various writings, Newman's whole life and work bear witness to his constant preoccupation with the furthering of the lay apostolate. While nothing which affected the welfare of the Catholic laity as a body was foreign to him, the Catholic priest and prelate, he was, as might be expected in one of his temperament and background, especially concerned with the intellectual needs of the educated layman, living in the insidious atmosphere of nineteenth century "Liberal" thought, and mingling with the cultivated members of non-Catholic English society.

It was mainly the desire to contribute to the work of forming a Catholic lay body equipped to defend the faith intelligently and successfully that led Newman in 1851 to accept the rectorship of the proposed Catholic University of Ireland.[16] When it became clear,

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 386–88.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 388.
[16] Cf. Wilfrid Ward, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 314–15.

with the passage of years, that his ideal of a University in Dublin which would be the Catholic intellectual center of the British Isles was destined not to be attained, he advocated the entrance of Catholic students into the existing non-Catholic Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, provided that Catholic influence and guidance be supplied for their religious and spiritual formation. It was only after his death, however, that the realistic wisdom of his stand on this point was recognized, and the long deferred ecclesiastical permission granted.[17]

The apostolate of the Catholic press was dear to Newman. His anxiety that thinking Catholics be kept abreast of the scientific and educational currents of the day involved him in the weary controversies which clouded the last years of the *Rambler* and the brief career of its successor, the *Home and Foreign Review*.[18] Newman realized the important part which might be played in the lay apostolate by a periodical which would treat, in a readable, thoughtful, thoroughly Catholic manner, of intellectual matters interesting to the Catholic world. Since this was the avowed aim of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign*, he felt that their directors, Sir John Acton and Richard Simpson, had a claim upon his sympathy. But even with (perhaps we should say, because of) his affectionate concern for the welfare of the educated Catholic laymen of England, he recognized not merely the value, but also the prudent restrictions of a Catholic lay review. He attempted to exert a restraining influence, warning Acton and Simpson to avoid the treatment of questions properly theological, and to refrain from gratuitous criticism of ecclesiastics and ecclesiastical affairs. On a letter from Sir John Acton, begging him to "consider my position, in the midst of a hostile and illiterate episcopate, an ignorant clergy, a prejudiced and divided laity," Newman noted: " 'his position'—Who gave it [to] him? Who gave him the mission?"[19] As to the brilliant but irritating Richard Simpson, Newman lost all hope. "I fear I must say I despair of any periodical in which he has a part," he wrote in 1861.[20] Newman regretted the failure of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign*, but with his complete

[17] Cf. Dom Cuthbert Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, New York, Benziger Brothers, 1926, Vol. II, p. 38.

[18] For a detailed treatment of the question of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign Review*, cf. Wilfrid Ward, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 478–567; also Dom Cuthbert Butler, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 308–329; and Wilfrid Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897, Vol. II, pp. 224–251.

[19] Wilfrid Ward, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 510.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 529.

sanity of outlook, he recognized that for a useful and successful exercise of the lay apostolate, not only must the aims be high, but the methods wisely chosen.

It would be possible to pursue at much greater length the record of Newman's efforts in behalf of the Catholic laity,—the paternal interest of the aging Cardinal in the early work of the Catholic Truth Society, for instance,—but we feel that the events of Newman's life are too well and widely known to demand further treatment here. Our purpose has been merely to summarize as briefly as possible his views on the nature of the lay apostolate. And while we have not attempted any comparison between Newman's opinions and recent Pontifical pronouncements, it seems safe to say that if John Henry Cardinal Newman were living today, the Holy See would be able to ask for no more loyal, convinced, and energetic collaborator in the great and urgent work of Catholic Action.

Washington, D. C. EDMOND DARVIL BENARD

QUIETISM

The recent Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* of our Holy Father Pope Pius XII condemns false mysticism and quietism. These two errors form but one erroneous system. Quietism is the effect of a false mysticism.

In explaining the nature of higher mystic unions, particularly of the transforming union, the mystics have fallen at times into gross exaggerations. It was either because they were unable to describe with proper terms the sublimity of the mystic union, or because "like the astronomers, they speak the language of appearances"[1] and seem to confuse the divine and the human nature. Our Saints and other orthodox mystics, as a rule, explain and correct any such exaggerations into which they have fallen. Thus, they speak of thinking by the eternal thoughts of God, loving by His infinite love, willing by His will. Orthodox mystics insist on the personal identity of the soul and its difference from the Godhead in the mystic union and the Beatific Vision. False mystics, on the contrary, are convinced of their absorption and transformation into the divine substance and claim divine attributes and operations.

Catholic theologians have often expressed the desire for a statement of the Ecclesiastical *Magisterium* on mystical subjects. The Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* offers a very clear and definite rule of conduct in all discussions regarding the nature of any mystic union when it says: "Let all agree uncompromisingly on this, if they would not err from truth and from the orthodox teaching of the Church: to reject every kind of mystic union, by which the faithful would in any way pass beyond the sphere of creatures and rashly enter the divine, even to the extent of one single attribute of the eternal Godhead being predicated of them as their own."[2] This golden rule protects the mystic writer from false mysticism and pantheism.

Quietism (from the Latin word *quies*, repose, inactivity) is the result of false mysticism. It is a theoretical and practical negation of asceticism. The basic principle of quietism is that Christian perfection is found only in a complete passivity of the soul. This passivity ap-

[1] ". . . . comme les astronomes, ils parlent le langage des apparences." Aug. Poulain, *Des Graces D'Oraison*, Paris, Victor Petaux, 1906, c. XIX, no. 14.

[2] Pope Pius XII, Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, June 29, 1943, (94.)

plies not only to mental prayer but to spiritual life in general. Any human effort or activity interferes with God's action. "Let God act" is the guiding principle of the quietists, meaning: Let God alone do everything. Early in life, a person, they say, should make an act of complete passivity. When this has been done, no other act of virtue is required, no resistance to temptation is necessary. Their perfection consists essentially of self-annihilation, mystical death, and absorption into the divine substance. Their part in the work of salvation and sanctification is limited to the passive exposure of their soul to the action of the Holy Spirit who does every thing in consequence of our union with Christ.

Quietistic tendencies are ever present. The same Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* condemns quietism and warns against its danger, adding thus one new condemnation to the long list of proscriptions of the same error: "Just as false and dangerous is the error of those who try to deduce from the mysterious union of all with Christ a certain unhealthy *quietism*. They would attribute the whole spiritual life of Christians and their progress in virtue exclusively to the action of the divine Spirit, setting aside and neglecting the corresponding work and collaboration which we must contribute to this action."[3]

The seventeenth century was the Christian century most afflicted with quietistic and semi-quietistic doctrines. We shall mention here the most famous quietistic writers of that period and their best known works.

The Capuchin Benedict Fytche, d. 1610, was the author of the *Regula Perfectionis; seu breve totius vitae spiritualis compendium.* This work was printed in 1625, and had many editions. It was condemned by the Holy See in 1689, together with about eighty other works of the same nature. The quietistic character of this book appears manifest in the full title of its English translation: *The Rule of Perfection,* "containing a brief and conspicuous abridgement of all the wholle spiritual life, reduced to only this point, of the Will of God" (Rouen, 1609).

The secular priest Antonio de Rolas wrote a book entitled *Vita dello Spirito* "ove s'impara a far orazione, ed unirsi con Dio." (Madrid, 1620.) As it was often the case with quietistic works, the false doctrines were presented in a clever manner, as the great secret of the Saints of God, hence the book was approved by several bishops before it was condemned in 1689. In this quietistic work, the author recom-

[3] *Ibid.*, 101.

mends to all persons alike a mental prayer without acts, except preparatory ones.

Father John Falconi of the Order of Mercy, who died in Madrid in 1638, and for a time after his death was honored as Venerable, wrote a *Lettre à une fille spirituelle; Lettre à un Religieux*, etc. His writings were condemned in 1688.

Pratique facile pour elever l'ame a la contemplation, by Francis Malaval, a layman of Marseilles, 1664. This work was soon attacked by Fr. Paolo Segneri, S.J. in his book *Sette Principii*, 1680, and was finally put on the Index in 1688.

Father of modern Quietism is the Spanish priest Michel de Molinos who lived for twenty years in Rome, where in 1675 he published his principal work, the *Guida Spirituale*. One of the latest Engish translations of this condemned work is that by K. Lyttelton, *The Spiritual Guide*, 1888. Molinos was very clever in presenting his quietistic doctrines, by using words and expressions consecrated by custom,—but giving them a new meaning. It is not surprising, therefore, that praise and admiration for his work were expressed by some Cardinals and Inquisitors of the Holy Office. One of those Cardinals, on becoming Pope Innocent XI, offered Molinos living quarters in the Vatican.

Dominican and Jesuit theologians protested against the new doctrine of Molinos, noting how under his influence entire religious communities were disregarding long established ascetical exercises, vocal prayer, confession, etc., in order to waste their time in quietistic inactivity or Molinistic contemplation. At the outset, Molinos' protectors turned against the accusers, and one of them, the Jesuit Fr. Paolo Segneri, narrowly escaped being condemned to death. Molinos' hypocrisy did not last very long however. His doctrine was examined and condemned by the same Pope Innocent XI in 1687. Sixty-eight condemned propositions, taken out of his writings, express his Quietism.[4] There were errors other than doctrinal in the charges brought against Molinos. He was convicted after a trial which lasted for two years. He confessed his immorality, and was condemned to life imprisonment. Nine years later, he died, reconciled with the Church.

About the same time, the works on Mysticism written by the Oratorian Pietro Matteo Petrucci, bishop of Iesi and later Cardinal, 1686, were proscribed by the Inquisition because affected by quietism. Petrucci submitted at once and resigned his bishopric in 1688.

[4] Denzinger, 1221–1288.

Other quietists of this period were Joseph Beccarelli of Milan who retracted, and the Barnabite Francis Lacombe, who was Mme. Guyon's director. His work *Orationis mentalis analysis* was condemned in 1688.

The first of the sixty-eight condemned propositions of Michael Molinos expresses the fundamental idea of Quietism: "Man must annihilate his powers, and this is the inward way."[5] If a person wishes to be active, he assumes a divine prerogative and offends God, who wants to act alone; hence every action, even in prayer, is an imperfection. "Let God act" means, therefore, remain passive and let God do everything. By such inactivity, the soul goes back to its origin, the divine nature into which it is then transformed (Prop. 5), in such a manner that the two are one, and so God lives and reigns in us (ibid.).

Quietistic passivity requires not only that no positively good actions of any kind be performed but also that no resistance be offered to temptations of any sort (Props. 35, 37, 38, 41, 42). Nothing must be asked from God; neither preparation nor thanksgiving are necessary for Holy Communion; no examination of conscience is advisable in the passive quietistic state (Props. 9, 15). The soul reaches a point where even the petitions of the Lord's prayer become objectionable (Prop. 34). Confession, theology, philosophy, are not for those who belong to the "inward way" (Prop. 59), because through their acquired contemplation they have reached a state of perfection where no sin is possible (Prop. 57). Having attained true deification and impeccability, the soul is not obliged to internal obedience to any superior, except God (Prop. 65).

Quietism found a fervent apostle in the French woman Mme. Guyon de la Mothe (1648–1717) whose writings amount to forty volumes, all of them condemned in 1689. Her principal works are: *Moyen court et très facile de faire oraison*, (Grenoble, 1685); *Les torrents spirituels; Opuscules; Sa Vie.* The last one appeared in an English translation by J. T. Allen, in 1898, as *Autobiography of Mme Guyon*, (2 vols). Also in English, there had previously appeared: *A Short Method of Prayer and Spiritual torrents*, translated by Marston, 1875. Francis La Combe and Fénelon became her directors, but she succeeded in making them her own disciples after filling them with her notions. Mme. Guyon was not a woman of culture nor was she endowed with good judgment. Her writings prove that she was satis-

[5] Denz., 1221: Oportet hominem suas potentias annihilare, et haec est via interna.

fied with any argument even when obviously false. But she had winning manners and knew how to make partisans. Preaching of God and prayer all the time, she made piety fashionable among the ladies of the court in France. Her piety, however, was pure quietism, abandonment carried to the extreme, namely to annihilation and spiritual death.

She demands obedience from Fénelon, who was her director: "Your littleness," she writes, "must extend itself to the point of believing and practising what God causes to be said to you by me" (*Letter 108*). She promises Fenelon the rank of a general in the great army of mystics, called "Michelins" or soldiers of St. Michael, who will establish the reign of true prayer on earth. In this mystical army that she intended to build there were offices of all sorts, a novice master, an almoner, a jailer, a street porter, a flower-girl, a portress, a female sacristan, etc. She has been defined, "half saint, half lunatic," entirely quietistic, but with some concessions towards activity. She marks the transition from pure quietism to semi-quietism.

Pure quietism like that of Molinos is fostered by Pantheism and Theosophism. It is an heretical system, based on false principles, leading to fatal consequences for morality. It is entirely opposed to Scripture and Tradition, wherein a Christian is urgently exhorted to work out his salvation by cooperating with the grace of God which is offered to all. Activity, efforts, endeavour, are demanded everywhere in the Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testament. The Decalogue, the performance of spiritual and corporal works of mercy enjoined by Christ as a necessary practice of a living charity, the precept of praying without intermission, the necessity for a Christian of denying himself, of taking up his cross daily and of following Christ in the practice of virtue, the necessity of hearing the Church and fulfilling her precepts,—all this means inward and outward activity, cooperation with God, not supine indolence and passivity.

The Protestant doctrine of justification without good works is fundamentally quietistic, with the difference that where a quietist makes an act of complete indifference or passivity, a Protestant makes an act of faith. Both expect God to do everything else with regard to their sanctification. For this reason, Protestants have rejected in part or entirely the Sacramental system. The necessity and utility of good works had been denied by Master Eckhart (1260–1327). His influence on Protestant thought, and the affinity of his doctrine with Protestant ideas, are well known. He affirms that the outward

act is not commanded by God, because it is neither good nor supernatural, and that God loves the soul not the exterior act.[6] The doctrine about sin of early Lutherans and of Michael Molinos can be found in Master Eckhart's 14th and 15th condemned propositions, (*Denz.* 514, 515). Master Eckhardt's principles were based on false mysticism and on quietism. He did not only admit a transformation and absorption of the just man into the divine substance, but also a perfect identity in nature and operation with God, including the creation of heaven and earth and the generation of the Word, (*Ibid.*, 510, 513).

Before leaving modern quietism, we must mention one of its common and well known variations, namely semi-quietism. Introduced by Mme. Guyon, it found its noblest victim, for a time, in the Archbishop of Cambray, François de Salignac Fénelon.[7] Here, too, we have the fundamental idea of waiting for divine action. When a practical resolution must be made, no action will be taken until we are urged thereto by God. The soul will wait doing nothing at all until the Spirit of God sets it in motion. This is acting by impulsion or fancy. The other idea which is characteristic of semi-quietism is the idea of "pure love." According to Fénelon, pure love is a perfect charity that excludes all fear, all hope, all thought of self-interest or advantage. It is an exaggerated disinterested love. It is exaggerated because it is carried so far that one becomes indifferent with regard to his own eternal salvation. Hope, like faith, remains with us in this life. Charity does not exclude hope but increases it. Even though the doctrine of "pure love" does not go to the absurd and immoral extremes of quietism, inactivity and passivity are encouraged by the fact that one becomes indifferent regarding his eternal salvation and depends exclusively,—and for everything, on the action of the Holy Spirit.

Fénelon's doctrine was attacked by Bossuet and subsequently condemned as erroneous by Pope Innocent XII in 1699. The seventeenth century is, thus, characterized by quietism and semi-quietism till its very end. Fénelon humbly and nobly submitted to the condemnation of his doctrine and retracted. The doctrine of "pure love," however, has preserved its appeal, as something heroic in the spiritual life, to simple souls who do not stop to consider its fatal consequences and implications.

[6] *Denzinger*, 516, 517, 519.

[7] His semi-quietistic doctrine of pure love is found in his booklet entitled "*Explications des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure*," Paris, 1697.

The quietists of the seventeenth century have only continued and enlarged quietistic doctrines disseminated in earlier centuries. The Alumbrados of Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were quietists professing doctrines received from the Pantheistic Brethren and Sisters of the free Spirit. According to these early quietists, perfection consists in complete absorption in God. The human will becomes identical with the divine. There is, then, no need for Sacraments, for law, for worship, and the person can indulge in carnal desires without staining the soul. The Beguines and the Beghards, condemned in the Council of Vienne (1311–12), and the Fraticelli, condemned a few years later (1318) by Pope John XXII, professed quietistic doctrines with regard to Christian perfection.

At the very beginning of Christianity, Antinomian Gnostics emancipated the soul of the "spiritual," who had acquired intuitive knowledge, from all obligations of moral law. The Messalians or Euchites (the "praying ones"), had only one duty, to pray. Prayer, according to them, makes a person entirely free. Passions and evil inclinations are no more. This was a kind of quietism.

The tendency of quietism has always been to reduce Christian duties and obligations to a minimum; the quietists of the seventeenth century reduced them to practically nothing.

Washington, D. C. PASCAL P. PARENTE

THE CIRCUMCISION

Many reasons are given to explain why our Lord submitted to circumcision, a sacred rite commanded by God as a sign of the Covenant and regulated in the Law given through Moses. If the purpose of the Incarnation and the significance of circumcision under the Old Law be taken into consideration, the fundamental reason for Christ's act will be found in the words of St. Paul: "When the fulness of time came, God sent His Son, born of woman, born under the Law, that He might redeem those who were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Gal. 4:4–5); "Sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as a sin-offering, He has condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3); and, giving an example to His disciples: "He emptied Himself, taking the nature of a slave and being made like unto men. And appearing in the form of man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient" (Phil. 2:7–8). The Circumcision of Jesus is comprehended in the purpose of the Incarnation to redeem mankind by the shedding of His Blood and to teach the way of salvation by word and example.

The humility of Christ in undergoing the rite and its redemptive character are explained by St. Bernard in a comparison between the Nativity and the Circumcision: "When the Word was made flesh at the Nativity, Christ was made a little less than the angels; but on the day of circumcision He was made even less, for then He had not only the form of man but also the form of sin. What, indeed, is circumcision, but an indication of sin?" Jesus bore this for our sakes, beginning the mission completed by His death: "At the Nativity, we celebrated Christ's advent into the prison of this world; today we commemorate His acceptance of our chains and bonds. In order to deliver the guilty, He placed His innocent hands in their chains; today, He who gave the Law was made subject to it" (*In cir. Dom.*, s. 3, n. 3–4).

Since Christ came in the likeness of sinful flesh for man's redemption, He bore all that sinful man must bear, except the guilt of sin. For this reason, St. Bede says, He submitted to the remedy by which original sin was healed before His coming. He likewise received the baptism of penance for the remission of sin, preached by St. John the Baptist, for the same reason, and also to show by what remedy He willed that men's souls be cleansed after His coming (*Hom. 10*, de cir.

Dom.). St. Thomas explains this redemptive purpose by a comparison with the sacred Passion: "As Christ voluntarily took upon Himself our death, which is the effect of sin, though He had no sin, in order to deliver us from death and to make us die spiritually to sin; so also He took upon Himself circumcision, which was the remedy against original sin, though He had not contracted original sin, in order to deliver us from the yoke of the Law and to accomplish in us a spiritual circumcision—in order that, by taking upon Himself the type, He might accomplish the reality" (3, q. 37, a. 1, ad 4).

By subjection to the Law He gained the graces granted through the reality, a purpose indicated by Him when He said that He came to fulfil the Law (Matt. 5:17–18). Jesus fulfilled the Law, not only by obeying it, but especially by instituting the realities typified and prefigured by the ancient rites and ordinances. The Old Testament rite of circumcision was a type of Baptism, the "spiritual circumcision" instituted by Christ (Col. 2:11–12). As St. Bernard remarks, *In Oct. Epiph.*, 1–2, Jesus received circumcision, commanded in the Old Law, before He instituted Baptism, prescribed by the New Law, just as He celebrated the Passover, prescribed in memory of the liberation from Egypt, before He instituted the Holy Eucharist, a memorial of His Passion and Death, prefigured by the Old Testament institution. Thus, He who is author of both the Old Law and the New, obeyed the precepts of the former that we might learn to obey the precepts of the latter. "Christ received circumcision at the time it was of precept," writes St. Thomas in answer to an objection. "And, therefore, His action is to be imitated by us in observing those things which are of precept in our time" (*loc. cit.*, ad 2).

In fulfilment of the prophecies, Jesus was the Son of David, the son of Abraham (Matt. 1:1). Because of the promise made to Abraham and David, and repeated by the Prophets, the circumcision of Jesus and its consequence had a particular meaning for the people of His own time. He was circumcised to show that He was a true son of Abraham and to remove an excuse for not accepting Him. Had He not submitted to the rite and to the observance of the Law imposed by it, there would have been an excuse for denying that He was the Messiah, a descendant of Abraham and David, according to the Prophets. Yet, while He is circumcised as a son of Abraham and shows forth the reality of His human nature, He is exalted in receiving a name that is above all names, in which alone there is salvation (Acts 4:12). The name Jesus, divinely commanded through an angel and imposed at the

circumcision, declares that He is the Savior, that He now sheds His Blood for the sins of His people and pledges Himself to take up the Law and to subject Himself to suffering and death for the redemption of the world.[1]

THE ORIGIN OF CIRCUMCISION[2]

Ancient testimony and modern research make it certain that circumcision was not practiced first or exclusively by the ancient Hebrews. The rite appears to be both the oldest and the most widely spread surgical operation we know. The earliest traces of it are found in Egypt; and it was also practiced by the Arabians, Ethiopians, Syrians, the primitive peoples of Africa, Australia, Malaya, South Pacific islands, Mexico and South America. The origin of the practice among the Gentiles is unknown, and authorities are not agreed upon its original purpose, whether it was tribal, sacrificial or utilitarian. The supposition of Herodotus (2, 104) that the custom originated in Egypt and passed thence to all other peoples is untenable. For, circumcision was practiced by widely separated peoples who could not have been influenced by Egypt; varying rites and circumstances of person and age were observed in its administration, even among neighboring peoples; and a different purpose and importance were attached to it by tribes and nations. The ancient custom was confined to peoples of warmer climates, and its origin would seem due to natural causes and modes of thought, whether ethical or utilitarian, common to all mankind under similar conditions.

Two contrary views have been expressed on the question of origin in as far as it affects the Hebrews and Egyptians. The opinion of Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, Celsus and Julianus, that the Hebrews took over circumcision from the Egyptians is widely advocated today. Embracing this view, the critical school sees two, sometimes three, Biblical accounts of the introduction of the rite among the Hebrews: Gen. 17:10–14 (P), Ex. 4:24–26 (J), Josue 5:2–9 (E).[3] An examination of these texts will show that the view has no Biblical support.

[1] Cf. St. Thomas, *loc. cit.*, corp.; St. Cyril of Alexandria, *in Luc.*, 2:21; St. Bernard, *In cir. Dom.*, s. 2., n. 3.

[2] Ermoni in *Dict. de Th. Cat.*, II, 2519 ff; Lesetre in *Dict. de la Bible*, II, 772 ff; Schegg in *KL*, II, 511 ff; Kortleitner, *Comment. Bibl.*, VII, p. 160; Jacobs in *JE*, IV, 96 ff.

[3] Oesterley-Robinson, *A History of Israel*, I, pp. 84, 121 f. The author's treatment of the texts is somewhat arbitrary. He sees "discrepancies" he himself has created.

The Exodus narrative (4:24–26) records that as Moses was returning to Egypt from Madian with his wife and son, the Lord threatened his life because he, for some reason or other, had neglected to circumcise his son. Thereupon, his wife Zipporah performed the rite upon the son and saved the life of Moses. It is claimed that this account is (or was) an attempt to explain the introduction of circumcision among the Hebrews—a meaning that can be obtained only by doing violence to the text. Though the narrative is obscure and the text contains several difficulties, it is clear that we have here no attempt to explain the introduction of the rite. For, "the account supposes that circumcision was practiced by the Hebrews and commanded by Jahve. Otherwise, how could Zipporah know that she could appease the anger of Jahve by circumcising the child? And would the people have taken up the practice simply because the son of Moses was circumcised, unless this had been commanded by some law? Moreover, there is no precept (of circumcision) given at the end of the narrative, which we must expect in that explanation."[4]

The Josue narrative (5:2–9) presents a number of details difficult to explain, but the general sense is clear. After the Hebrews crossed the Jordan and were encamped at Gilgal, God commanded Josue to circumcise all the people, because this had not been done in the desert. At the completion of the ceremony, the Lord said: "This day have I taken from you the reproach of Egypt." Rejecting the explicit statement of the text that the Hebrews were circumcised in Egypt, which is also supposed in Exodus 12, some see here another attempt to explain the introduction of the rite. In this explanation, the "reproach of Egypt" is said to mean that the Hebrews had not practiced circumcision previously and had thus incurred the contempt of the Egyptians. But we may ask: "Why should they fear the contempt of the Egyptians after they had left Egypt? And why should an Egyptian practice be proposed as a means of gaining favor with the Lord? Why is there no mention here of a law by which the people were commanded to continue the rite, if this is its introduction? Since the Hebrews had now entered the Promised Land and their wanderings were at an end, the most satisfying explanation of the "reproach of Egypt" is: Through compliance with the law, suspended in the desert, and entry into the Land of Promise, the inheritance promised to the descendants

[4] Heinisch, *Das Buch Exodus*, p. 62; cf. Grimmelsmann, *The Book of Exodus*, p. 33 f.

of Abraham, they have become the peculiar and absolute possession of the Lord and fully emancipated from the servitude of Egypt.[5]

The exodus and Josue narratives, if allowed to speak for themselves, do not attempt to explain the introduction of circumcision among the Hebrews. Both narratives suppose the rite already in existence and commanded by law. The only Biblical account of the origin of the rite as prescribed for the descendants of Abraham is contained in Gen. 17. When God made the Covenant with Abraham and promised him a numerous posterity (among whom would be the Messiah), He commanded that all male children be circumcised on the eighth day after birth. The rite was commanded and introduced as "a sign of the Covenant"; and the uncircumcised were excluded from the people of God. Because circumcision was a sign of the Covenant, it also became a pledge of man's willingness to observe the laws and purposes of that Covenant (Gal. 4:3), and a symbol of internal justice, "the circumcision of the heart" (cf. Deut. 30:6; Jer. 4:4). Circumcision as practiced under the Old Law was essentially and exclusively a religious rite; no other purpose or significance is attached to it in the Old Testament. Among the Hebrews, after they were made the people of God, circumcision was a sacred rite introduced by command of God; no other account of its origin is to be found in the Bible.

This command of God, introducing the sacred rite, does not mean that the physical act was then first introduced into the world and that all others, specifically the Egyptians, learned it from the Hebrews. This view was proposed by Ibn Esra, Theodoret, the *Recognitiones Clementis*, and finds some supporters today. Certain exegetical arguments brought forth by the proponents of this view have little, if any, value. They argue from the fact that Pharao's daughter recognized the infant Moses as a Hebrew child (Ex. 2:6); but she could recognize the origin of the child from the fact that it was exposed on the Nile to escape the decree of Pharao. From Jer. 9:24–25 and Ezech. 31:18, where all Gentiles are called uncircumcised, they conclude that the Hebrews alone practiced circumcision; but these and similar texts speak of the rite established by divine law and accompanied by "cir-

[5] Schulz, *Das Buch Josue*, p. 19; Hummelauer, *Comm. in 1. Jos.*, p. 165. Some authors (e.g., Breen, *Harmonized exposition of the Gospels*, I, p. 169) claim that the text proves that the Egyptians were uncircumcised at that time. This explanation is no more acceptable than that the Hebrews had not previously practiced circumcision. The Josue narrative, as Heinisch remarks (*Das Buch Gen.*, p. 239), should not be brought forward in a discussion of the question of origins.

cumcision of the heart." In this sense all Gentiles were uncircumcised, and the Hebrew who possessed only external circumcision was like them. Since circumcision was a distinctive sign of the Covenant, they argue that no other nation practiced it; otherwise, it would not have been a distinctive sign. But the rite as practiced under the Old Law was distinctive of the Hebrews, even though the practice was known to others; or, as others say, it sufficiently distinguished them from their immediate neighbors, who were uncircumcised. The reception of Gentile converts, recorded in the Old Testament, would not prove that no Gentile was circumcised.[6] Finally, the evidence that circumcision was practiced in Egypt before the time of Abraham is sufficient to disprove this view.

The Egyptians did not learn circumcision from the Hebrews; nor did the Hebrews simply take over a practice of the Egyptians. The second part of our conclusion is based on the command of God, given in Genesis, and is confirmed by differences in practice. Among the Hebrews, circumcision was essentially a religious rite and commanded by strict precept; in Egypt, however, there was no law prescribing it nor any religious significance attached to it. Among the Hebrews, the rite was received by all, and only, male children on the eighth day after birth; in Egypt, on the other hand, it was practiced only by certain castes, an analogous ceremony was observed for females, and the time for circumcision was adolescent or later years. The only similarity between the Hebrews and the Egyptians consisted in the physical act common to all peoples who practiced circumcision.

This custom, probably known to Abraham, may be said to have afforded occasion for the divine command and institution which gave the natural act a new significance and a new entity. God often uses the natural for a spiritual and supernatural purpose. The phenomenon of the rainbow existed and was admired by man from the beginning of creation. Because of its aptitude as a symbol, God made it the sign of His Covenant with Noah after the deluge, giving it a new and religious significance. The natural act of cleansing the body with water gave occasion for the Old Testament purifications, rites symbolic of moral cleansing. And in the New Law, Christ gave to the same act, when placed according to His will, the dignity of a Sacrament. Thus also, God gave to circumcision a new and peculiar signification, attached spiritual signification to it, and made it a purely religious

[6] Circumcision was repeated in those Proselytes who were already circumcised—Zschokke, *Hist. Sacra*, p. 63; Kortleitner, *Arch. Bibl. Sum.*, p. 163.

rite for the descendants of Abraham by which they were reminded of the purpose of their selection as the people of God. In as far as it was a sacred rite under the Old Law, circumcision owes its origin to the command of God and to no other cause.

SIGNIFICANCE OF CIRCUMCISION

According to the unanimous teaching of theologians, circumcision was one of the Sacraments of the Old Law. It was an external sign, permanently instituted by God, and effected some manner of sanctification. The divine institution of the sign and its permanence under the Old Law are stated in Gen. 17:11–12. In the divine institution it was made a special sign of the Covenant, and by the impression of this sign upon their bodies the Hebrews entered the Covenant and pledged themselves to the purposes of the Covenant. Signifying separation from the Gentiles (the unclean) and dedication to God, it effected at least legal sanctification.

Circumcision was also representative of the faith of Abraham; for, he received "the sign of circumcision as a seal of the justice of faith which he had while uncircumcised" (Rom. 4:11). St. Paul's thought in the passage containing this text is: Abraham is the "father" or model of all the uncircumcised who would believe, as well as the "father" of the circumcised who would imitate his faith; so that faith, of which circumcision was an external sign, is the essential requisite for the true children of Abraham. The same thought is expressed in a somewhat different manner in Rom. 2:28–29. The sense of this passage, in as far as it concerns our subject, is: Physical circumcision is of no advantage unless it be accompanied by observance of the Law and by that which it symbolizes, the "circumcision of the heart." This internal circumcision is desired by God and effected by divine grace. Only those who possess it—whether circumcised or not—constitute the genuine Israel of God.[7] This symbolic signification was not first applied by St. Paul. It was also taught by the Law and the Prophets: "The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart . . . that thou mayest love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul" (Deut. 30:6); "Be circumcised to the Lord and take away the foreskins of your hearts . . . lest my indignation come forth like fire and burn" (Jer. 4:4).

Like many other rites and ceremonies of the Old Law, circumcision

[7] Cf. Boylan, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews*, *in loc.*; Bardenhewer, *Der Romerbrief*.

also prefigured the graces to be granted through and by Christ. The typical signification of circumcision is indicated by St. Paul, when he says: "You have been circumcised with a circumcision not wrought by hand, but through putting off the body of the flesh, a circumcision which is of Christ. For you were buried together with Him in Baptism" (Col. 2:11–12). This revised translation, placing the adversative particle after the first clause, is in closer agreement with the Greek text than is the Vulgate, which places "sed" before the last clause of the sentence.[8] Physical circumcision is "wrought by hand"—a removal of part of the flesh. To this St. Paul opposes a removal or cutting off of the "body of the flesh"—or of "the carnal body" (*τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός*). This means stripping off "the old man with his deeds," i.e., the old sinful man inherited from Adam and corrupted through its lusts; and it is accompanied by putting on the "new man," regenerated by grace and created in justice and holiness of truth (cf. Eph. 4:22–24). This spiritual circumcision is wrought by Christ in the Sacrament of Baptism.

The typical character of circumcision is clearly taught by the Fathers. Thus, St. Augustine briefly says: "At that time, circumcision was a Sacrament which prefigured Baptism of our times" (*De anima*, 2, 11, 15). After stating that "there is no doubt that circumcision was instituted by divine precept to forecast, as in an image, the truth of future things," St. Epiphanius says: "That circumcision was carnal which served until the great circumcision, that is Baptism, which circumcises us from sin" (*Haer.*, 8, 4 and 6). Since there is little, if any, external similarity between circumcision and Baptism, the type depends upon their immediate signification and effect. St. Cyril of Alexandria thus states the similarity: "As a type of divine Baptism, circumcision foretold grace and power. For, as the circumcised were admitted into the people of God, so also the baptized, receiving as it were the seal of Christ, are numbered among the children of God" (*in Luc.*, 2:21). St. Thomas explains the typical character as consisting in the profession of faith (3, q. 70, a. 1). In Baptism, a profession of faith is made and the recipient becomes a member of the faithful; in circumcision, there was also a profession of faith and the recipient became a member of the people of God. As all things

[8] The comparison between circumcision and Baptism is brought out more clearly in Spencer's translation: "In Him also you were circumcised—with a circumcision not done by hand—by stripping off the carnal body in the circumcision of Christ, you having been buried with Him in Baptism" (*The New Testament*, p. 546).

happened to the fathers of old as a type of the future (1 Cor. 10), and as their faith was the same as ours, circumcision prefigured Baptism, not in the external rite but in the profession of faith.

EFFICACY OF CIRCUMCISION

It is certain from the Councils of Florence and Trent that the Sacraments of the Old Law, including circumcision, did not possess the same power and efficacy as the Sacraments of the New Law.[9] We wish to discuss here the efficacy of circumcision as a remedy for original sin in infants; and further limit our discussion to a summary of the contents of Scripture and Tradition, and the common teaching of theologians.

Genesis 17:14, appealed to with varying degrees of certitude, does not afford direct proof that original sin was remitted in circumcision. The penalty there imposed upon the uncircumcised Hebrew: "shall be cut off from my people," has received two interpretations. Some say the penalty is death; but this is not supported by the Old Testament idiom or by the custom of the Jews. There remains the second interpretation: the uncircumcised Hebrew is excluded (excommunicated) from the people of God and deprived of all the blessings promised by the Covenant.[10] The reason for the penalty: "he has broken my Covenant," directly refers to the Covenant with Abraham, of which circumcision was the sign. From both the penalty and its cause some draw the conclusion that circumcision remitted original sin.[11]

Tradition contains many clear expressions of this doctrine. St. Ambrose, explaining why infants were circumcised, says: "As there is sin in infancy, so also is there circumcision in infancy. . . . The infant is not excluded, because every age is subject to sin, and therefore every age is capable of a Sacrament" (*De Abra.*, 2, 11). Saints Augustine, Gregory, Bernard and others, teach that in circumcision there was wrought what is now effected by Baptism; while others, as Saints Fulgentius, Isidore and Bede, argue from Gen. 17:14 that, since the infant could not be guilty of a personal sin if uncircumcised, "he has

[9] Florence, *Decr. pro Armenis*, (Denz., 695); Trent, sess. 7, c. 2 compared with c. 6 (Denz., 845, 847).

[10] Cf. Hoberg, *Die Genesis*, p. 183; Hetzenauer, *Comm. in 1. Gen.*, p. 278, where authorities for both interpretations are cited.

[11] Lamy, *Comm. in Gen.*, p. 76; Franzelin, *De Sacram.*, 21 ff. Innocent III draws the conclusion from a comparison between Gen. 17: 14 and John 3: 3 (*3 decret.*, tit. 42, c. 3).

broken my Covenant" refers to the original transgression of Adam, in whom all have sinned.[12]

On the other hand, St. Paul teaches that the rites and ceremonies of the Old Law were "weak and beggarly elements" (Gal. 4:9), and that "by the works of the Law no human being shall be justified before God" (Rom. 3:20). Man is justified by faith (Rom. 1:17), and under the Old Law man was made just by faith in the Redeemer to come. As a consequence, observance of the Law was in itself not a cause of justification or the remission of sin. There seems to be no reason for excluding circumcision from this evaluation of Old Testament works; for it was the first of the "weak elements" and the introduction to the "works of the Law." Moreover, St. Paul expressly states the insufficiency of circumcision when speaking of Abraham, the prototype of the justified, who was made just by faith, not by circumcision (Rom. 4:9 ff). "The general object of Abraham's faith was the divinely promised posterity (carnal and spiritual) that was to be his; and this faith included, at least implicitly, belief in the Savior. . . . Both in its nature and object, the justifying faith of Abraham was essentially the same as the *fides theologica*, which is the beginning and root of our justification."[13]

The Fathers also teach that the Sacraments of the Old Law, including circumcision, possessed no power to justify. St. Augustine, speaking of the Sacraments of both dispensations, says they were not the same; for, "the Sacraments of the New Law give salvation, those of the Old Law promised the Savior. . . . The Sacraments are changed; they have become easier, fewer, more salutary and fruitful" (*In Ps.*, 73, n. 2). Commenting on Hebrews 7:19, St. Chrysostom writes: "The Law profited much, but it availed nothing towards making men perfect; for the Law brought nothing to perfection. Therefore, he says, the Law was unprofitable; for all—circumcision, sacrifice, sabbath—were but types and shadows which could not perfect the soul" (*In Hebr.*, hom. 13, 2). From the justification of Abraham through faith, without circumcision, Saints Chrysostom, Justin and Irenaeus conclude that circumcision did not affect justification, but was only a sign; while others, as Saints Epiphanius, Basil and John Damascene,

[12] St. Augustine, *c. lit. Petil.*, 2, 72; *De nup. et conc.*, 2, 11, 21; St. Gregory, *Mor.*, 4, 3; St. Bernard, *Ser. in Pass. Dom.*, 2; St. Fulgentius, *Ep. 17*, 15, 31; St. Isidore, *QQ. in V. T.*, in Gen., 13; St. Bede, *In Pent. Comm.*, Gen. 17; *In Luc. expos.*, lib. 1, c. 2.

[13] Boylan, *op. cit.*, p. 65. St. Thomas teaches: "Eadem est fides nostra et antiquorum patrum" (3, q. 70, a. 1).

indicate the same doctrine when contrasting circumcision and Baptism.[14]

Two conclusions or propositions may be drawn from the foregoing summary: In circumcision the infant was freed from original sin and justified without any work of its own; Circumcision, like all other Sacraments of the Old Law, did not of itself confer grace. These two propositions, embodying the common teaching of theologians, are not contradictory. The mode of conciliating the seeming discrepancy was indicated by St. Augustine, whom we have cited for both propositions. In the Old Law, he says, infants were liberated from sin by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, whose coming was foretold by circumcision. The Sacraments were changed after the coming of Him whose advent they prefigured, but there was no change in the aid of the Mediator who, even before His coming, delivered the ancients by their faith in His Incarnation (*De pec. orig.*, nn. 31–32). "It was the self-same faith (as ours) which saved the saints of old, both great and small—not the Old Covenant which brought forth children in bondage; not the Law which was not given so as to give life; but the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (*De nup. et conc.*, 2, c. 11). Therefore, sin was remitted because of (or, by) faith in the Redeemer to come, not by circumcision considered in itself (cf. *In Num.*, q. 25).

St. Thomas, whose doctrine on this point has become the common teaching of theologians, writes in his commentary on Romans: "Circumcision had no efficient power *ex opere operato*, either for the removal of guilt or the operation of justice, but was merely a sign, as the Apostle says. But through faith in Christ, of which circumcision was a sign, it remitted original sin and gave the aid of grace" (c. 4, lect. 2). In the *Summa*, he teaches that circumcision remitted original sin; and since sin is not remitted except through grace, he also teaches that circumcision conferred grace as to all its effects, but not as in Baptism. In Baptism grace is conferred by the very power of Baptism, a power which it has as instrument of Christ's Passion already consummated. But "circumcision conferred grace inasmuch as it was a sign of faith in the future Passion of Christ; so that one who accepted circumcision professed that he embraced this faith, whether, if an adult, he made profession for himself, or, if an infant, another made profession for him. . . . Just as before circumcision only faith in Christ to come

[14] St. Chrysostom, *In Gen.*, hom. 27, 3; St. Justin, *Dial. c. Try.*, 44; St. Irenaeus, *c. Haer.*, 4, 16; St. Epiphanius, *loc. cit.*; St. Basil, *de Spiritu Sancto*, 14, 32; St. John Damascene, *De Fide Orth.*, 4.

justified both children and adults, so also after circumcision" (3, q. 70, a. 4).

Before Christ came, man was justified in view of the merits of Christ by aggregation to the people of God through faith in the Promised Redeemer. Under the natural law, infants were justified by some external act placed in their name by an adult—the *sacramentum naturae*—an act which was a profession of faith and placed the infant in the ranks of the faithful. This external act itself was not a cause of grace; but the act being placed, God in His mercy remitted original sin and infused grace in view of the merits of Christ to come. The *sacramentum naturae* was succeeded by the *sacramentum legis* when God determined circumcision as the only external act by which the salutary profession of faith could be made for Hebrew male infants; and by this act they were aggregated to the people of God and made participants in the Messianic graces. Though this act of itself had no power to justify, it was the divinely assigned condition without which the infant could not obtain the grace of justification. Not circumcision itself, therefore, but faith in the Promised Redeemer signified by circumcision, remitted original sin and justified these infants under the Old Law. Thus we can understand that infants also were justified, not by works but by faith, not by the Law but by the promise of God (Rom. 4; Gal. 3:18). Because of the connection between justification and the prerequisite condition, we can also understand how the Fathers teach that circumcision remitted original sin, while also teaching that the rite itself had no power to effect justification.

Norwood, Ohio RAYMOND F. STOLL

"You have not chosen Me: but I have chosen you; and have appointed you, that you should go, and should bring forth fruit, and your fruit should remain." (John 15:16.) "Going therefore, teach ye all nations . . . and behold I am with you." (Mt. 28:19, 20.) "You shall be witnesses unto Me." (Acts 1:8.) In these statements of Our Lord, and in virtue of our ordination and our delegation from the Bishop we have the supernatural background of all our preaching. We have Christ with us and behind us in all our sermons and instructions. We are not to preach ourselves but Jesus Christ: "it is not ourselves that we proclaim but Jesus Christ." (II Cor. 14:1.) "It is on Christ's behalf that we are acting as ambassadors; God, as it were, appealing to you through us." (II Cor. 5:20.) All this should make us realize that in preaching we are but instruments through whom Christ talks. We should do a sufficient amount of preparation but when we go into the pulpit we should have Christ behind us and let Him talk through us. This will give us poise, confidence and security; it will enable us to face any subject, any audience: we are not proclaiming ourselves but Jesus Christ. "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me." (Gal. 2:20.)

We must watch the atmosphere into which we enter when setting about the thinking out of a sermon. Saint Paul tells us what that should be when he speaks of "Prophesying" in his letter to the Corinthians. (I Cor. 14:3, 4.) This prophesying as explained in a footnote on page 475 in the new American translation of the New Testament can readily find its counterpart in our ordinary preaching. "He who prophesies," to quote the American version, "speaks to men for edification, and encouragement, and consolation." "He who prophesies edifies the church." Edify, of course, means *build up*. To give a more particular translation of Saint Paul's Greek we have: "He who explains doctrine is speaking to his fellow-man words that *build up* the household of the faith, and *give comfort* and *encouragement*." "He who instructs builds up the household of the church." This from the Holy Ghost settles for us the atmosphere in which the mind of the sermon writer is to dwell; the attitude of mind that should be his towards his subject and his people. Therefore the controlling background of all our thinking must be construction; we must aim to lift up, to console, to inspire.

It is so easy to get into an atmosphere of vituperation, of scolding; to think that we must hammer our people, must scare them, must whip them into walking the pathway of virtue and goodness; but such an atmosphere, such an attitude, does not conform to the spirit of the Holy Ghost, nor the spirit of Our Lord, of whom it is written: "The bruised reed He shall not break . . . and in His name the Gentiles shall *hope*." (Mt. 12:20, 21.)

The subject of your sermon may be the common definite ones of sin, death, judgment, hell, and the like; or you may have to found your sermon on the Epistle, the Gospel, the occasion, or the feast day.

The first step is to bring your audience mentally before you, and to keep them there all through your thinking and writing. If you think only of your subject you are apt to turn out an essay, not a sermon. Then with your audience in mind advert to your subject and endeavor to find in it some thought that will help your audience definitely to better living. This thought must be definite, practical, helpful, inspirational. The way to get this thought is to ask yourself what in your source matter appeals to you. The Holy Ghost surely helps in this since you are setting out under your commission "Go and teach!" We must pray for this help of the Holy Ghost.

It may take some time and a lot of prayerful thinking to get settled in your own mind this one definite thought for your audience, and you must think it over till you can express it in a simple declarative sentence. When you have thought out this sentence you really have your whole sermon. The rest of your work will be but a development of this sentence, for this sentence will be the proposition of your sermon. Unless you can state in a simple declarative sentence just what you are going to talk about you have not as yet thought out your subject definitely and clearly. If you do not know thus definitely and clearly what you are going to say, your audience surely will never know it either. In the writing of your sermon this one definite thought must be brought out clearly and made to recur constantly so that your hearers can not fail to get it. They ought to be able after hearing your sermon to tell some one else what you talked about by stating your own simple declarative sentence.

This thought must be one that appeals to you, that you see would influence you; if it does not appeal to you, you can not very well make it appeal to others; we humans are all pretty much alike. The *γνῶθι σεαυτόν* of the Greeks is a wise saying: if we know ourselves we know others, what appeals to us will appeal to them.

Having obtained this definite thought, write it down, what it means to you, and all the reasons why it appeals to you. Do not run off to books for your development; draw on your own habitual knowledge first, then if need be, seek the help of books. This will give your own treatment to the matter, and so impart originality to it, which makes it interesting to you and to your audience.

Various plans for the development of thought are given but the old reliable classical form can hardly be improved upon; it is the natural manner of presenting a thought.

THE CLASSICAL PLAN

In the Exordium: we introduce ourselves and our *general subject* to our audience.
In the Narration: we tell *why* we pick this general subject.
In the Proposition: we determine the *particular phase* of this general subject we have selected to talk about.
In the Exposition: we expand this phase, say all we want to say about it.
In the Refutation: we settle difficulties or doubts that may arise concerning this particular phase.
In the Peroration: we sum up and drive home what we have said on this particular phase.

For instance:

1. We are going to talk on some *general* subject; say: "God."
2. *Why* on this subject? So important, so fundamental, etc.
3. Just what in *particular* we are going to consider regarding this general subject; that God is *merciful*, for instance.
4. How we show the truth of this particular: He who says and does so and so is merciful, but God says and does so and so. This is the body of your sermon, the "proof." Its matter should be arranged sequentially and climactically.
5. Meet difficulties concering this particular; n.g. suffering; Hell.
6. Rehearse the proofs of our particular topic, and urge response to it in our lives.

We might put the same plan another way: We are going to enter a general field of thought; why that field? Just what particular part of that field we are going to examine; we view all the content of that particular part; settle doubts; sum up and sell that particular part.

Try to get "surprises" out of the subject: what Shelley calls "the before unapprehended relationship of things." To this end it will help to study the *words* of your subject matter. For example: in

the Easter sermon, Our Lord rose from the grave and broke the bonds of death. Speak of the metaphorical grave or bonds: What grave are we perhaps in? what bonds should we break? The grave, the bonds of the capital sins, of passions, of indulgences, of weaknesses, of indifference, etc. For Holy Thursday: Our Lord gave the world *food*: "Bread for the life of the world." What "food" does the world give? the flesh? the devil? secular education? modern literature? magazines? movies? etc.

Thus the metaphorical use of a word makes the plain meaning of the word a jumping-off place and is apt to open a whole sky full of matter which will be novel and so interesting to you and to your audience. Notice too, just what this is: it is bringing to the attention the obvious; the "before unapprehended relationship of things." We do not as a rule see the obvious that is alway lying at the surface of things and people are pleased when their attention is called to it.

More examples of thought finding. "Lord, that I may see!" eye-darkness, mind-darkness, soul-darkness. Saint Paul: "What have you to do with darkness?" "You are the children of light, of the day!" "I am the Light of the world!" "He that walketh after Me walketh not in darkness, but hath the light of life." "Men love darkness because their ways are evil." Sin is darkness, the brightness of the soul, Sanctifying Grace, is gone out. The darkness of the world, of modern education, etc.

"They have taken away my Lord!" Christ taken away from the home, the school, business, civil life, international affairs, world. Is He lost to you? to your home? to your thoughts? etc.

Study Chesterton's play with words; notice the imagination in Carlyle; read Emerson's essay "The Poet." Contrasts and opposites help to widen thought: a virtue, its absence, its contradictory vice, v.g. a home that has control as a permanent guest; a home where drunkeness or any other vice is a frequent visitor.

Make your sermon graphic, paint pictures, after the manner of Our Lord all through the Gospels, and the manner of Isaias and the other prophets. To get appealing dress for our thought, which means to get appealing thought, we must go deliberately into the world of the imagination, out of the world of cold dry intellect. Our Lord told the deepest truths in the terms of flowers, lilies, grass, birds of the air, fishes of the sea, the building of a house, the sower of seed, sunlight, darkness, night. People understand these things, and by them Our Lord took them from the known to the unknown. Such language

attracts, holds, and is remembered. Such language, too, is emotional; and the difference between an essay and a sermon is that a sermon should be emotional, for unless we stir up the emotions we can not persuade, and persuasion is the purpose of a sermon. The endeavor of a sermon is to bridge the chasm that lies between "I know, I believe," and "I will do!"

The subject of attractions is synonomous with the subject of motives. If we are to get people to do things we must give them influencing motives, influencing attractions. Human action is made up entirely of our *going towards* something that attracts us, or of *going away* from something that repels us, or resting in or away from those things. The human motion of the will going towards something receives the general label of "love"; the motion of the will away from something is labelled "hate." And this gives us another fundamental principle that must be kept in mind if our sermons are to be effective. Saint Thomas (I–IIae, Q. 29, Art. 2) thus states this principle: "Love is the cause of all hates." To quote the English Dominican translation: "Love must needs precede hatred; and nothing is hated, save through being contrary to a suitable thing which is loved. And hence it is that *every hatred is caused by love*," which means that if we are to hate sin, for instance, we must first have a love for God, for Heaven, for Christ, for virtue, for decency, and the more fostered this love is the weaker will be the false attractive power of sin. Our late Holy Father in his encyclical on Christian Marriage bids us apply this principle when he come to talk on the remedies for the difficulties found in married life; "Get our people" he says, "back to God."

Things we want or do not want are motives urging us to action. All human beings want possession, distinctions, pleasures. Riches, honors, comforts, these are the ever-operating motives of all human action. Our work in preaching is to turn these fundamental drives of human nature towards worthy objects; to make our people see the eternal possessions, distinctions, and pleasures in such an illuminating light that opposing possessions, distinctions, and pleasures of earth and time automatically move off into the dark.

Brooklyn, N. Y. JOHN A. COTTER, S.J.

THE USE OF THE TERMS BODY AND SOUL WITH REFERENCE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

In the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* our Holy Father Pope Pius XII has acted energetically to end what had become a source of serious confusion in teaching about the Catholic Church.

> We deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who conjure up from their fancies an imaginary Church, a kind of Society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which they somewhat contemptuously oppose another, which they call juridical. But this distinction, which they introduce is baseless.[1]

The *funestus error* reproved by the Sovereign Pontiff exists in Catholic theological literature under the guise of teaching on the body and soul of the Church. Some authors have described the *soul* of the Catholic Church as an invisible, spiritual society, and then designated the existing and visible Church as the *body*, the counterpart of that soul. The invisible or spiritual Church is presented as a society of good men and women in the state of grace, bound together by ties of faith and charity. According to those who have used the distinction rejected in the *Mystici Corporis* this soul of the Church is a *society* which exists even outside the membership of the visible Church. It is distinct from the Church of which the Roman Pontiff is the visible head, and yet it is in some way connected with it. The expression "members of the soul of the Church" which has unfortunately crept into the revised Baltimore Catechism[2] seems to involve some such teaching.

The distinction condemned by the Holy Father is used ordinarily to explain the connection between non-Catholics who are saved and the Catholic Church. Such a connection must exist, since the Church is necessary for the attainment of the beatific vision. To obviate what seemed to them a difficulty, some writers postulated the existence of a social organism of men and women who possess charity. This invisible Church or soul of the Church was depicted as wider in extent than the visible society, distinct from it, yet in some manner belonging with it. The body and the soul were presented as parts of that universal Church to which a person had to belong in order to be saved.

[1] *AAS*, XXXV (1943), 224; The NCWC translation #64, p. 40.
[2] *The Number Two Catechism*, Lesson 12, #168.

Once and for all, the *Mystici Corporis* has stigmatized such an hypothesis as erroneous. There is no Church of God in this world in any way distinct from the one visible society which Jesus Christ instituted during the days of His earthly sojourn, and which He placed under the supreme and visible direction of St. Peter and his successors. Furthermore there is no society in this world composed only and entirely of persons in the state of grace. The just on earth are not organized into any society, made up exclusively of their own number.

The men who have applied the terms body and soul of the Church to the distinction condemned by the Holy Father have twisted metaphors found in Scripture and in the *De Ecclesia Militante* of St. Robert Bellarmine into meanings which they were never meant to convey. St. Paul called the Church the body of Christ, and the *Mystici Corporis* warns us against perverting his terminology.

> For some there are who neglect the fact that the Apostle Paul has used metaphorical language in speaking of this doctrine, and failing to distinguish the physical from the social body of Christ as they should, out of their fancy drawn some deformed kind of unity.[3]

There is a tendency, however, to attribute every use of the terms body and soul of the Church in modern theological writing to St. Robert Bellarmine. Thus he is sometimes falsely represented as the source for the type of teaching condemned by Pope Pius XII. The truth of the matter is that paradoxically enough, the very terms which have been twisted to designate a distinction between a visible and an invisible Church appear in St. Robert's *De Ecclesia Militante* integrated into proofs that no such dichotomy exists.

The saintly Controversialist employed the terms body and soul with reference to the Catholic Church much more extensively than the other classical ecclesiologists. The terms are metaphors, and St. Robert used them effectively and scientifically as metaphors. He used the analogy of body and soul to explain various portions of his teaching on the nature of the Church. We find each term used in three distinct meanings in the *De Ecclesia Militante.*

1) The *body* is used to designate the Catholic Church itself. "The Church is a living body."[4] St. Robert speaks of God the Holy Ghost

[3] *AAS*, p. 234; NCWC translation, #84, p. 52.

[4] *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus Huius Temporis Haereticos;* Tom. I, Ingolstadt, 1586, *Quartae Controversiae Generalis*, Liber III, *De Ecclesia Militante*, cap. 2, col. 1264.

as the *soul*, the correlative of this body. "The Church is governed by Christ, as by its Head and its Spouse, and by the Holy Ghost as by its Soul."[5]

2) The external professon of faith and the communication of the sacraments are called the *body* within the Church, or of the Church. The internal gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, charity and the rest constitute the corresponding *soul*.[6]

3) Good Catholics constitute the interior part, and as it were the *soul* of the Church, while the wicked persons within the Church are its exterior part, and as it were the *body*.[7]

While the other great ecclesiologists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries never used the terms body and soul as extensively as did St. Robert, they were perfectly familiar with the distinctions which he sought to illustrate by the use of this analogy. We would be doing St. Robert a grave injustice were we to imagine that he brought some new concept of the soul and body of the Church into Catholic theology. What he actually did was to employ the analogy of body and soul to illustrate distinctions for which other theologians had used other terms. It was only when later and lesser theologians in the eighteenth century mistook the metaphors of St. Robert for factors which had to be explained in their own right that the process towards confusion was begun. In the *De Ecclesia Militante* there are no two entities indicated exclusively as *the* body and *the* soul of the Catholic Church.

St. Robert employed these terms as instruments for effective teaching. There is a definite and easily understandable relationship between a body and a soul, and the great Controversialist used this analogy to designate factors between which a somewhat similar relationship exists. The Catholic Church has an essential reference to the Holy Ghost. The external profession of the Christian faith, and the communication of the sacraments under legitimate ecclesiastical authority are related to the three theological virtues. The wicked Catholics have a definite reference to their virtuous coreligionists. In each case the relationship could be explained to some extent by means of a comparison with the relationship existing between a body and a soul.

The *Mystici Corporis* uses the analogy of body and soul in only one

[5] Op. cit., cap. 14, col. 1315.
[6] Op. cit., cap. 2, col. 1264.
[7] Op. cit., cap. 9, col. 1294.

way. The body is a name of the Church, while the Holy Ghost is called the Soul of the Church.

> If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ,——— which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church,———we shall find no expression more noble, more sublime or more divine than the phrase which calls it "the mystical Body of Jesus Christ."[8]

The *Mystici Corporis* cites Leo XIII in calling the Holy Ghost the Soul of the Church. "Let it suffice to say that, as Christ is the Head of the Church, so is the Holy Ghost her Soul."[9]

There is good reason why the analogy of body and soul can help us to appreciate the relation of the Catholic Church to the Holy Ghost. The function of the Blessed Trinity, appropriated to the Holy Ghost as the Soul of the Church is quite distinct from that of our Lord, Who, as man, is the Head of this society. There is one, and only one invisible and temporal mission of the divine Persons. This takes place in and with the gift of sanctifying grace. God, Who is in all things by His presence, power and substance, has chosen to dwell in some intellectual creatures in yet another way, as an Object to be known, loved and enjoyed as He is in Himself. Thus this mission, appropriated to God the Holy Ghost, renders a man competent to know and love God as He is in Himself, and not merely as He can be recognized as the first Cause of creatures.

In the fatherland of heaven, this knowledge is the beatific vision itself. In this world the supernatural awareness of God is to be found in faith, the preparation for the vision. The knowledge and the love of God resultant from the indwelling of the Holy Ghost and expressed in the acts of the theological virtues are social rather than merely individual. They tend to unite men within the Catholic Church, and together the acts of the supernatural virtues constitute the basic operation of that Church. Thus, since the Holy Ghost, dwelling within the Church, acts as the ultimate Principle of its corporate unity and life, His function within this society bears some resemblance to that of a soul within a living physical body. So it is that the metaphor *soul* is useful and effective in explaining His work in the Church of Jesus Christ.

It is of course impossible to conciliate this use of the term soul with the expression "members of the soul of the Church." There are mem-

[8] *AAS*, p. 199; NCWC translation, ¶ 13, p. 11.
[9] *AAS*, p. 220; NCWC translation, ¶ 56, p. 35.

bers of a body or of a society. There can be no members of the Holy Ghost. Furthermore the men and women in whom the Holy Ghost dwells through sanctifying grace do not constitute any social organization by themselves in this world.

Historically, the false use of the terms body and soul has come from a failure to understand St. Robert's second application of this analogy. This time the terminology is St. Robert's own. While the other classical ecclesiologists commonly used the terms body and soul to designate the Church and the Holy Ghost, they did not employ these metaphors to designate the external profession of the faith and the communication of the sacraments on the one hand, and the three theological virtues on the other. In order to understand St. Robert's use of this analogy, we must see these terms in their proper context.

St. Robert used this analogy in the second chapter of his *De Ecclesia Militante*, the chapter in which he presents his famous definition of the Church. This chapter opens with the citation and the criticism of five formulae which the heretics had used to describe the true Church of Jesus Christ. Then follows the definition which has become classical in Catholic theology.

> But it is our teaching that there is one Church, and not two, and that this one and true Church is the assembly of men gathered together in the profession of the same Christian faith and in the communion of the same sacraments under the rule of legitimate pastors, and particularly of the Roman Pontiff, the one Vicar of Christ on earth.[10]

The great Controversialist employs the terms body and soul in indicating the difference between his definition and the various formulae which had been offered by heretics.

> Our teaching differs from all the others in this, that all the others require internal virtues to constitute someone as within the Church, and therefore they make the true Church invisible. But although we believe that all the virtues, faith, hope, charity and the rest are found in the Church, still, in order that someone be said to be absolutely a part of the true Church spoken of in the Scriptures, we do not think that any internal virtue whatsoever is required, but only the external profession of faith and the sensibly perceived communion of the sacraments. For the Church is as visible and palpable a society as the assembly of the Roman people or the kingdom of France or the Republic of the Venetians.
>
> But we should remember from Augustine, in the *Breviculus Collationis*,

[10] Op. cit., cap. 2, col. 1263.

in the third conference, that the Church is a living body, in which there is a soul and a body. The internal gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, charity and the rest are the soul. The external profession of the faith and the communication of the sacraments are the body.

Hence it is that some are of the soul and of the body of the Church *de anima et de corpore Ecclesiae* and thus both inwardly and outwardly united with Christ the Head. These are most perfectly of the Church, for they are like living members in a body, although even among these some partake more of life and others less. And some even have only the beginning of life, and as it were sensation but not movement, as those who have faith alone without charity.

Again, some are of the soul and not of the body, as catechumens or excommunicated persons, if they possess faith and charity as they very well may.

Finally others are of the body but not of the soul, as those who have no internal virtue, but who still profess the faith and communicate in the sacraments under the rule of the pastors by reason of some temporal hope or fear. Such persons are like hairs or fingernails or diseased fluids in the human body.

Therefore our definition takes cognizance of only this last way of being in the Church, since this is required as a minimum in order that a person may be said to be a part of the visible Church.[11]

Such is the teaching of St. Robert Bellarmine. Taken in their proper context, the terms body and soul of the Church prove to be instruments employed by St. Robert in establishing his contention "that there is one Church and not two," and that this one Church of Jesus Christ is as visible an organization as any civil society. It was not St. Robert, but rather the followers of Luther and of Calvin who distinguished between a visible and an invisible Church. This was the very error which the great Doctor of the Church set out to overthrow.

St. Robert speaks of the three theological virtues as the soul in or of the Church. Manifestly there can be no such thing as a "member of the soul of the Church" in this sense. Faith, hope and charity constitute neither a body nor a society.

The people whom St. Robert designated as "of the soul of the Church" are, in the light of his own teaching, those who possess the virtues which are found within the Catholic Church and which the heretics had claimed as requisite for membership in the Church. Those who are "of the soul and not of the body" are precisely the individuals who have these virtues without being actually members of

[11] Op. cit., cap. 2, col. 1264.

the Church. Neither the soul nor the persons who are said to be "of" that soul could be considered as forming a society in any way distinct from the one visible Church of Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, the counterpart of this soul is not the Church itself. The external profession of faith and the communication of the sacraments constitute this correlative body. The theological virtues and the other factors which St. Robert designated as the corresponding body are forms or forces which tend to unite a man to Christ, the Head of the Church. Those who are "of" both the soul and the body of the Church are said to be "inwardly and outwardly united to Christ the Head."

A man is inwardly united to Christ in so far as he elicits some supernatural activity stemming from the *gratia capitalis* of our Lord Himself. No man can have the supernatural life, or even the beginning of that life as found in faith without charity, unless it be communicated to him by Christ. Thus there is a necessary contact between our Lord and every man who falls within the category of those who are "of the soul of the Church." But this union is invisible and inward, brought about in and through the communication of divine grace.

The outward union with Christ is the factor by which a man places himself in the ranks of the Church militant. The Church, as a society, is the body of Christ, and thus the man who is a part of this society is actually joined to our Lord. The persons who are "of the body of the Church" according to the terminology of St. Robert, are precisely those who fulfill the minimum and essential requisites for being parts of this society, and who thus are outwardly and visibly in contact with Christ.

St. Robert offers catechumens and excommunicated persons as examples of those who are not of the body of the Church, but who may be of the soul. He teaches explicitly that such people are not members of the Catholic Church.[12] Yet, far from postulating the existence of some spiritual and invisible society or Church, in any manner distinct from the Catholic Church, to which such persons would belong and through which they could achieve their eternal salvation, St. Robert teaches distinctly that they can be saved by being of the Church by desire.[13]

Thus there is one, and only one necessary social vehicle of salvation.

[12] Op. cit., chapters 3 and 6; columns 1265–1266; 1274–1277.
[13] Op. cit., cap. 3, col. 1266; cap. 6, col. 1276.

There is no society in any way distinct from the visible Catholic Church through which men may attain to the beatific vision. The men who are saved must be either actually members of this Church or desire to enter this society as members. Such a desire must be sincere, even where, by reason of faulty instruction it is implicit rather than explicit.

St. Robert's use of the metaphors body and soul aptly explains the relationship between the external profession of faith and the three theological virtues. The factors which constitute a man as a member of the Catholic Church are the external profession of the faith and the communication of the sacraments. The man who makes a profession of the Catholic faith should really believe. The person who receives the sacraments should receive them with the proper dispositions, and thus possess the life of charity. Without the factors which St. Robert indicated as the *soul*, the external profession of the faith and the communication of the sacraments would suffice to establish a man as a member of the Catholic Church. However they would not make him a living member. Apart from the elements which St. Robert named as the soul, the corresponding external acts would be meaningless and insincere. Since the three theological virtues, together with the other internal gifts of the Holy Ghost, act to vivify and inform the elements which St. Robert designated as the body, the analogy of body and soul is useful as a means for teaching about their relations with the factors which contribute to make a man a member of the Church.

In the ninth chapter of the *De Ecclesia Militante*, St. Robert drew the terms of his analogy of body and soul from the same source, but attached different meanings to the terms. Once again he mentions St. Augustine's use of the analogy in the *Breviculus*, albeit St. Robert does not record the fact that the actual terms *corpus et anima* do not occur in the passage to which he refers. But, where before the soul of the Church was used to designate "the internal gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, charity and the like," now the good Catholics are represented as constituting the interior part, and as it were the soul of the Church. Where, in the second chapter, the external profession of the faith and the communication of the sacraments constituted the body of the Church, here in the ninth chapter the *quasi corpus* is made up of wicked Catholics.

In the ninth chapter St. Robert deals with the thesis that a great and manifest sinner can be a part of the Catholic Church. Among the objections he considers is one based upon assertions of St. Augustine,

to the effect that Christ cannot have members who have been damned. The terms *quasi corpus*, and *quasi anima Ecclesiae* occur in the response to this objection.

I answer that, because of these statements, not only Brentius and Calvin, but also certain Catholics fancy that there are two Churches. However this is truly imagination, since neither the Scriptures nor Augustine ever speak of two Churches, but only of one Church. Certainly, in the *Breviculus Collationum*, in the third conference, when the Donatists falsely charged the Catholics with holding two Churches, one of which would contain only the good while the other would hold both good and wicked persons, the Catholics answered that they never dreamed that there were two Churches, but that they had only distinguished parts or stages of the Church.

There were parts since the good belong to the Church in one way and the wicked in another. For the good are the inner part, and as it were the soul of the Church *quasi anima Ecclesiae*. The wicked are the outer part and as it were the body *quasi corpus*. And they gave the example of the inner and the outer man *de homine interiore et exteriore*, who are not two men but two parts of the same man.[14]

Not by any means all of the men who are said to be "of the soul of the Church" in the second chapter, appear in the ninth chapter of the *De Ecclesia Militante* within the *quasi anima Ecclesiae*. Only good Catholics, members of the true Church who are in the state of grace are said to constitute the *quasi anima*. Not only these persons, but all those who have the true faith, whether they are in the state of grace or not, and whether they are members of the Church or not, are classed as "of the soul of the Church" according to the terminology of the second chapter.

Obviously there is nothing in this last use of the terms body and soul favoring the existence of an invisible Church. The terms *quasi corpus* and *quasi anima* actually appear within a passage devoted to the proof that no such organization exists. There is no such thing as a member of this "soul of the Church," since the Catholics in the state of grace have no special social organization distinct from that of the Church itself. Only a body or a society can have a member.

Yet, at the same time, the fact remains that good Catholics and wicked Catholics do not belong to the Church in the same way. Those who are in the state of grace possess that supernatural activity which is the basic community life of the Catholic Church. The wicked within the Church do not contribute towards this activity. They are

[14] Op. cit., cap. 9, col. 1294.

as it were carried along in an organization which lives a life of supernatural perfection. Thus they stand in somewhat the same relation to good Catholics as the body does to the soul within the human composite.

St. Robert himself is authority for the statement that even in his time certain Catholics had postulated the existence of a twofold Church. However it was not until the eighteenth century that men began to abuse his terminology to propound a thesis which was wholly distasteful to him. Charles du Plessis d'Argentré, Honoratus Tournely and Louis Legrand who contributed towards the use of the terms body and soul to designate a twofold Church no longer considered these words as metaphors, but thought of them as names for some realities which demanded an explanation in their own right. Now that the Holy Father has reproved the doctrine of the twofold Church, we may look forward to a decided improvement in popular ecclesiology.

Washington, D. C. JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

Answers to Questions

WRITTEN PETITIONS

Question: What is to be said of the custom of placing written petitions in a holy place—for example, on the altar or before the statue of Our Lady—with the obvious implication that the prayers they contain will have greater efficacy?

Answer: Acts of devotion such as are mentioned in this letter are by no means to be condemned. The placing of an object in a holy place with the hope that a special blessing may be conferred on those whom it represents or those who will use it is not alien to the spirit of approved Catholic devotion. Thus, the palliums which are sent by the Pope to metropolitans are previously placed on the tomb of St. Peter. The placing of a written petition on an altar or shrine can justly be regarded as a manifestation of faith in the power of prayer on the part of the one who wrote it. Furthermore, the writer will be stimulated to greater fervor by the thought that a script presenting his plea to God or to one of the saints is in a hallowed spot.

On the other hand, superstitious notions should not be mingled with this act of devotion. The faithful should be taught that the written petition as such does not possess any efficacy toward moving God to grant the desired favor, nor does its resting in a holy place give it any special power to cure diseases or to obtain other extraordinary results. By believing such things they would put themselves in the class of those who ascribe special efficacy to a rabbit's foot or to a "lucky penny."

COOPERATION IN ABORTION

Question: May a Catholic nurse take any part in an operation involving a direct abortion?

Answer: A reply to this query depends on many factors, particularly the precise nature of the function which the nurse is expected to perform, the inconvenience which would result in the event that she refuses to assist at the operation, and the possibility of scandal. At

most, her co-operation may be merely material—that is, if there are justifying circumstances she may perform an action which is in itself lawful, but which will be utilized by the doctor who is performing the operation for the accomplishment of this sinful action. The more intimately her function concurs toward the operation, the greater reason does she need to be allowed to perform it. Thus, a nurse would not be justified in giving the anaesthetic or in handing the instruments to the operating surgeon, unless some very great misfortune would otherwise be incurred, such as the complete frustration of her career as a nurse. The mere fact that she would have to leave this particular hospital would not be a justifying reason if she could still find professional employment, even though less desirable and less lucrative. On the other hand, such remote participation as preparing the patient for the operation or sterilizing the instruments beforehand would be allowed if a refusal would bring about her dismissal from the particular hospital in which she is working. It is well to note that a Catholic nurse who has a justifying reason for participating in a sinful operation should make known to her associates her repugnance to the operation and the reasons why the Catholic Church denounces it as sinful.

THE CRUCIFIX AND THE OSTENSORIUM ON THE ALTAR

Question: Why is it wrong to have the ostensorium occupy at Benediction the place ordinarily filled by the crucifix, the latter being temporarily removed? Certainly, the simplest of our people can distinguish between the crucifix and the ostensorium in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed for adoration. Our altars are usually so constructed that the obvious place for the ostensorium in under the canopy above the tabernacle, the place which the crucifix usually occupies. If you must not place the ostensorium here, where should you put it? Authors tell us that the same place will not do for both the crucifix and the ostensorium, even if the crucifix is removed during the time of Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, but they do not tell us the reason for this prohibition and they make it difficult to find any other becoming place for the ostensorium.

Answer: The practical difficulty in conforming to the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (No. 4136) which forbids the use of the same place as the position of the crucifix and the throne for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament lies in the more usual construction of our altars. We are accustomed to see a permanent throne of exposition

erected over the tabernacle, which is quite correct, but when the crucifix is ordinarily stationed on this throne, to be removed for the ceremony of exposition, it is quite incorrect. On the conventional altar, this throne above the tabernacle should be reserved exclusively for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. In this instance, a place for the crucifix may be found by building a niche in the reredos, above and behind the permanent throne of exposition, or a painting (altar-piece) of the Crucifixion or a Calvary group on the wall in back of the altar may supply the place of the altar crucifix. The latter, by the way, is presumed in the rubrics to be of more massive proportions that the more or less moveable crucifix, which is so often seen. The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. I, Cap. xii, 11) directs that the altar crucifix tower above the six "high" candles. What we more frequently see, however, are giant candlesticks and a comparatively dwarfed crucifix. A liturgically correct crucifix is naturally not easily removed so that when the construction of the altar makes no permanent provision for a throne of exposition, the Sacred Congregation of Rites (No. 4268, *ad IV.*) prescribes the use of a moveable throne, placed over the tabernacle, or in some other prominent place, and taken away after Benediction. Such a portable throne for exposition is the common Roman usage. When a new altar is to be built, the architect should be instructed concerning the laws of the Church regarding the place of the crucifix and that of the ostensorium. The ingenuity of the designer should find an artistic solution of the difficulty involving ostensorium and crucifix, which is the result of the faulty construction of many altars.

As to the other member of our enquirer's question, the reason for separate places for the crucifix and the ostensorium, the answer seems very obvious. The idea underlying the prohibition of using the throne of exposition as the regular station for the crucifix is not the result of any fear that the faithful will not be able to distinguish between the crucifix and the Sacred Species, solemnly exposed in the ostensorium. Because of the superlative dignity of the Blessed Sacrament, a distinct place for exposition is logically indicated. Not even the crucifix should be enthroned under the baldachino over the tabernacle, which is destined for the ostensorium. The throne of exposition, whether permanent or moveable, therefore, must be reserved exclusively for the Blessed Sacrament. Some other place must be found for the crucifix. The finding of such a place should not be a difficult problem for a competent architect.

DISPOSITIONS OF PENITENT

Question: May a confessor absolve a penitent who states that he is sure he is going to fall into mortal sin again?

Answer: Some theologians teach that even one who is certain that he will sin gravely in future may have the purpose of amendment required for the reception of sacramental absolution. For, they argue, the purpose of amendment is an act of the *will* based on the penitent's *present* dispositions; the certainty of a relapse into sin is an act of the *intellect,* judging that at some *future* time there will be a change of dispositions (cf. Noldin, *Summa Theologiae Moralis,* III, 261). However, although this view seems theoretically correct, in practice a subjective conviction that one is going to sin gravely in future would seem to cast very grave doubt on the firmness of the purpose of amendment, so that a confessor would not be justified in absolving a penitent with such a conviction (excluding, of course, extraordinary circumstances, such as danger of death). Such is the solution given by St. Alphonsus (*Theologia Moralis,* L.VI, n. 451).

However, the confessor should remember that the firm purpose of amendment is not incompatible with a reasonable fear, or even probable judgement, of future fall into grave sin. In fact, it not infrequently happens that those who say they are sure they are going to relapse really mean that they fear this will happen. In such a case the confessor should encourage the penitent with the assurance that God's grace will not fail him in time of temptation and impart absolution.

HOLY COMMUNION IN A HOSPITAL

Question: Is it permitted to dispense with lighted candles in giving Communion to a sick person in a hospital on account of certain undesirable results that might otherwise ensue, such as the danger of fire, the irreverent curiosity of other patients in the ward, etc.?

Answer: To administer Holy Communion without lighted candles is, itself, a venial sin. Accordingly, a reasonable cause would justify a priest in dispensing with them. If the reasons mentioned by the questioner, or similar reasons, are actually present in a particular case, he could administer the Blessed Sacrament to a sick person without candles. However, the priest should regard it as a matter of con-

science not to extend this practice to cases in which there is no justification for a dispensation from the rubrics. Certainly, reasons of personal convenience, the avoidance of a little extra trouble, would not be a sufficient justification. At any rate, it would seem that candles could be used, at least ordinarily, when Holy Communion is given in a private room or in a portion of a ward that is protected by a screen from the view of the other patients.

Analecta

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

DE PROHIBITIONE LIBRORUM

Cum in pravis libris denuntiandis morae et omissiones sint saepe conquerendae plurimique christifideles in exitiali ignorantia circa denuntiationem et prohibitionem perniciosorum librorum versentur, Suprema S. Congregatio Sancti Officii opportunum ducit praecipua sacrorum canonum de hac re praescripta in memoriam revocare; per prava enim vel noxia scripta puritas fidei, integritas morum ipsaque salus animarum maximis periculis exponuntur, ut compertum est.

Profecto innumera scripta fidei ac moribus adversantia, quae praesertim nostris temporibus ubique terrarum et variis linguis quotidie fere eduntur, Sedes Apostolica ipsa sollicite ac tempestive prohibere nequit. Opus proinde est, ut locorum Ordinarii, quorum est sanam et orthodoxam doctrinam conservare ac bonos mores tueri (c. 343, 1), per se aut per sacerdotes idoneos vigilent in libros, qui in proprio territorio eduntur aut venales prostant (c. 1397, 4), et quod damnandos iudicaverint, eos suis subditis prohibeant (c. 1395, 1). Ius et officium prohibendi ex iusta causa libros pro suis subditis competit etiam Abbati monasterii sui iuris et supremo religionis clericalis exemptae Moderatori cum suo Capitulo vel Consilio immo, in casu urgenti, aliis Superioribus maioribus cum proprio Consilio, ea tamen lege ut rem quantocius deferant ad supremum Moderatorem (c. 1395, 3). Attamen libros, qui subtilius examen exigant vel de quibus ad salutarem effectum consequendum supremae auctoritatis sententia requiri videatur, ad Apostolicae Sedis iudicium Ordinarii deferant (c. 1397, 5).

Omnium quidem fidelium, praesertim clericorum, est libros perniciosos competenti auctoritati denuntiare; sed peculiari titulo id pertinet ad clericos in dignitate acclesiastica constitutos, ut sunt Legati Sanctae Sedis locorumque Ordinarii, atque ad eos qui doctrina ceteris praecellunt, ut Universitatum catholicarum Rectores Doctoresque.

Denuntiatio autem facienda est vel huic Congregationi S. Officii, vel Ordinario loci, declaratis quidem causis, quibus liber prohibendus existimetur. Iis vero, ad quos denuntiatio defertur, sanctum esto nomina denuntiantium secreta servare (c. 1397, 1, 2, 3).

Denique Ordinarii locorum aliique curam animarum habentes fideles opportune moneant: *a*) prohibitionem librorum id efficere,ut liber sine debita licentia nec edi vel iterum edi (nisi factis correctionibus et legitima approbatione obtenta), nec legi, nec retineri, nec vendi, nec in aliam linguam verti, nec ullo modo cum aliis communicari possit (c. 1398, 1, 2); *b*) libros ab Apostolica Sede damnatos ubique locorum et in quodcumque vertantur idioma prohibitos censeri (c. 1396); *c*) lege positiva ecclesiastica esse vetitos non tantum libros speciali decreto ab Apostolica Sede singillatim damnatos et in *Indicem librorum prohibitorum* relatos, vel a Conciliis particularibus sive ab Ordinariis pro suis subditis proscriptos, sed etiam libros prohibitos *ipso iure communi*, idest ex regulis (c. 1399) contentis, quibus fere omnes libri pravi et de se noxii modo generali prohibentur; *d*) ex lege naturali vetari cuiuslibet libri lectio, quae proximum periculum spirituale praebeat, cum ius naturae prohibeat, ne quis se constituat in periculo amittendi veram fidem aut bonos mores; itaque licentiam utendi libris prohibitis a quovis obtentam nullo modo eximere ab hac prohibitione legis naturalis (c. 1405, 1).

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 17 Aprilis 1943.

I. Pepe, *Supr. S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

Resolutio.—In plenariis autem comitiis diei 12 Decembris 1942 Emi Patres huius Sacrae Congregationis ad propositum dubium: *An, ad mentem canonis 1435 § 1 n.4, collati cum canonibus 6 nn. 2–4 et 20 C.I.C., sit Apostolicae Sedi reservatum beneficium resignatum intuitu alterius beneficii reservati*; responderunt: *Affirmative.*

Quam resolutionem in Audientia diei 20 Decembris 1942, referente subscripto eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis Secretario, Sanctissimus Dominus Pius Pp. XII benigne approbare et confirmare dignatus est.

I Bruno, *Secretarius.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

MARIANOPOLITANA SEU ALBANEN. IN AMERICA

Beatificationis et Canonizationis Venerabilis Servae Dei Catharinae Tekakwitha, Virginis Indae.

Super Dubio

An constet de virtutibus theologalibus Fide, Spe, Caritate tum in Deum cum in proximum, nec non de cardinelibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine earumque adnexis in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.

* * * * * *

Sanctitatis fama, qua Catherina vivens fruebatur, vehementius post eius obitum mire percrebuit et ad nostra usque tempora virescit, uti patet ex pluribus postulatoriis litteris ab omni fidelium coetu, immo et a nonnullis infidelibus, Pio Papae XI fel rec. oblatis, ut beatorum honores huic Virgini, primae ex borealis Americae sylvicolis, conferrentur. Servatis itaque omnibus de iure servandis, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa XII causae Introductionis Commissionem die 19 Maii a. D. 1939 signavit, suscepto et recognito Sacrae huius Congregationis Historicae Sectionis voto. Quum autem Causa haec inter historicas adnumeretur. ad Motus Proprii Pii Papae XI normas de causis historicis, apostolico processu omisso, tota res eidem nostrae Sectioni demandata est; quae, omnibus documentis diligenter collectis, iisque ad severam trutinam, ea qua pollet sagacitate perpensis, favorabilem informationem amplissima et concinna relatione confecit. Haec omnia porro una cum R. P. Promotoris Generalis Fidei animadversionibus in Antepraeparatorio Sacrae huius Congregationis Coetu coram subscripto Cardinali Causae Ponente seu Relatore die 26 Novembris mensis anno 1940 fuere examini subiecta.

Iterum in Praeparatorio die 10 Novembris sequentis anni: demum in Generali coram Sanctissimo D.N. die 9 Iunii elapsi anni, in quo idem Cardinalis Relator dubium posuit discutiendum: *An constet de virtutibus theologalibus Fide, Spe, Caritate tum in Deum cum in proximum nec non de cardinalibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine earumque adnexis in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.* Revmi Cardinales, Officiales Praelati, Patresque Consultores sua edidere suffragia: quibus exceptis, Beatissimus Pater, ut iteratis precibus Deus suam mentem potiori lumine ditare dignaretur, Suam ad hunc usque diem sententiam proferre distulit.

Eapropter subscriptum Cardinalem, R.P. Salvatorem Natucci, Fidei generalem Promotorem, meque Secretarium accivit atque, Sacro pientissime litato, edixit: *Constare de virtutibus theologalibus Fide, Spe, Caritate tum in Deum cum in proximum nec non de cardinalibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine earumque adnexis Venerabilis Servae Dei* Catharinae Tekakwitha *in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.*

Hoc autem decretum rite promulgari et in acta sacrae Rituum Congregationis referri mandavit.

Datum Romae, die 3 Ianuarii a D. 1943.

✠ C. Card. Salotti, Episc. Praen., *Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

A. Carinci, *Secretarius.*

ROMANA

Beatificationis et Canonizationis Servi Dei Pii Papae X
Super Dubio

An signanda sit Commissio Introductionis Causae in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.

* * * * * *

Sanctitatis fama, qua Servus Dei, dum vivebat, honestabatur, vehementius post mortem erupit, sive quia magna in Pontificatu facinora fuerat operatus, sive potissimum quia virtutum splendore nituerat, qui non modo fidelium verum etiam plurimorum a religione alienorum oculos perculerat. Insignis enim Dei Famulus exstitit humilitate, caritate in proximum, rerum temporalium despectu atque paupertatis amore. Vere christiana pietate sibi sanguinis vinculo coniunctos adamavit, quos tamen noluit ex humili, in qua erant nati, condicione extollere. Deum prae oculis habens, quae Ei placita esse iudicaret, agebat. Iure itaque sanctitatis fama universe hac in Causa emanavit.

Neque, uti ferunt, vera miracula a Deo, eius interventione patrata desiderantur, neque aliae rationes, quae eamdem famam comprobant atque confirmant.

Merito itaque auctoritate Ordinaria canonicae inquisitiones in Urbe et, per rogatoriales litteras, Venetiis, Mantuae atque Tarvisii, cum super eadem fama, tum super scriptis atque liturgico cultu eidem non praestito sunt peractae.

Interim innumerae Summis Pontificibus litterae, Beatificationis et Canonizationis Causae Introductionem expetentes, ab omni Ecclesiastico et civili ordine oblatae sunt.

Scriptis perpensis, die 20 Novembris a. 1940, S.C. *Nil obstare* decrevit, *quominus ad ulteriora procedi possit.*

Servatis itaque de iure servandis, instante Revmo D. Alberto Parenti C. V. U. O. S. B., Postulatore rite constituto, in Ordinariis S. R. C. Coetibus, diebus 19 Ianuarii et 4 Februarii, anni huius, habitis, infrascriptus Cardinalis, S.R.C. Praefectus et Causae Ponens seu Relator, dubium proposuit discutiendum: *An signanda sit Commissio Introductionis Causae in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur,* atque de Causa retulit.

Emi ac Revmi PP. Cardinales, relatione hac suffragiisque officialium Praelatorum, nec non R.P.D. Salvatore Natucci, Fidei Promotore generali auditis, suam aperuere mentem, quam subscriptus Cardinalis

Beatissimo Patri die 12 Februarii renuntiavit. Sanctitas Sua, horum suffragiis ponderatis, eadem die *Commissionem Introductionis Causae Servi Dei Pii Papae X sua manu signare dignata est.*

Datum Romae, die 12 Februarii a. D. 1943.

✠ C. Card. SALOTTI, Ep. Praen., *Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

A. CARINCI, *Secretarius.*

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness.

April 29, 1943: Monsignors Thomas O'Regan and Martin McNicholas of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

May 25, 1943: Monsignors John O'Brien, Joseph A. King, John F. Kraemer and William Schaefers of the Diocese of Wichita.

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary to His Holiness.

February 25, 1943: Monsignor Lalor Richard McLaughlin, of the Diocese of Paterson.

February 26, 1943: Monsignor Joseph F. McGeough, of the Archdiocese of New York.

February 28, 1943: Monsignor Walter Carroll, of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

May 20, 1943: Monsignors Robert Degasperi, Thomas Michael Kealy and John Quack, of the Diocese of Belleville; Monsignors Patrick Gavan, Henry Ferdinand Schuermann, Antony Theodore Strauss and Alfred Gerald Thomson, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis; and Monsignors Leo Klasinski and Leo McNeill, of the Diocese of Wichita.

June 2, 1943: Monsignors Henry A. Hoerstman and John Sabo of the Diocese of Fort Wayne.

Book Reviews

ACTION THIS DAY. LETTERS FROM THE FIGHTING FRONTS. Francis J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York, Military Vicar of the Armed Forces of the United States. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 1943. Pp. xiii + 256. $2.75.

Last year, in his capacity as Military Delegate for the Armed Forces of the United States, the Archbishop of New York called on the Holy Father and visited the American fighting men engaged in the war against our European adversaries. During his journey, which took nearly half a year and which brought him to places as remote from Madison Avenue as Tehran and Mauritius, the Archbishop wrote twenty-six letters to his father in Whitman, Massachusetts. These letters, together with a brief introduction and a prayer for his beloved America, make up the book—*Action This Day.*

There was action, almost an incredible amount of it, every day during that journey. Twelve crowded pages of index list persons with whom the Archbishop conferred and places he saw. The letters tell of visits with Franco, Churchill, De Valera, Giraud, De Gaulle and Smuts, as well as with the President of Turkey, the Prince Regent of Iraq, the Shah of Iran and the newly reinstated Emperor of Ethiopia. They speak of meetings with Princes of the Church, with religious, civil, military and diplomatic leaders at almost every point in the Military Vicar's forty-six thousand mile itinerary. But the book is most concerned with the soldiers, the chaplains and the missionaries.

Every page of *Action This Day* manifests the Archbishop's profound affection for the soldiers he has been called upon to serve, together with his pride in and respect for those priests who have been privileged to work in the Chaplains' Corps. No less evident however is wholehearted admiration for the missionary priests, Brothers and Sisters, "soldiers also, soldiers whose term of enlistment never ends" (p. 178).

Most interesting, but poignant, are the paragraphs which tell of the Archbishop's ten days in the Vatican. "The Holy Father has aged with more than years since last I saw him when he was Cardinal Pacelli" (p. 32). "The Pope thinks, works, prays, and literally dies for peace. He wishes the conquerors to be not only just with the conquered but also merciful. He knows full well that revenge is a bitter, gnawing thing" (p. 35). *Action This Day* will surely bring men of our country to sympathize more profoundly with the Vicar of Christ, to pray and to labor with him for a just, speedy and Christian peace.

The Archbishop of New York shares with the Roman Pontiff his love

for peace and his burning intolerance of hatred among men. The men and the things he saw drove that lesson home. Nowhere were the effects of hatred more apparent than in the story of unhappy Spain. Archbishop Spellman writes of reports that more than fifteen thousand priests, and about the same number of nuns were killed there during the Civil War. And, according to an informant familiar with Spain, twenty four hours of disorder in that country "could mean the assassination of every bishop, priest, and nun that could be found" (p. 22). Such is the bitterness which the Holy Father prays may be overcome through a Christian peace.

Action This Day is the sombre story of a journey through a war torn world. Those who read it, (and it is a book which should be read) will be better prepared to work for a peace victorious over hatred.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

THE CREED EXPLAINED. Joseph J. Baierl, S.T.D., 5th edition, The Catechetical Guild, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1943. Pp. xxvii + 550. $3.75.

The teaching of religion, especially the method and content of courses, has received a gratifying amount of attention during the past two decades. Books and catechisms have been multiplied, teaching aids have been popularized, and sound pedagogical methods have been explained to our teachers of religion. No small credit for this healthy condition is due to Father Baierl. His latest book, *The Creed Explained*, is another contribution to his long list of catechetical material. This work is a complete and enlarged revision of the well-known text bearing the same title which appeared in 1919. It brought to our teachers their first acquaintance with the famous Munich or Psychological Method. The influence of the earlier work in improving the teaching of religion in our country has been enormous. Dr. Baierl made accessible a method which is flexible and pedagogically sound and he illustrated it with a complete and excellent explanation of the catechism.

The Introduction to the present edition is entirely new. It presents the basic principles and utility of the Munich Method clearly and forcefully. The author follows the new Baltimore Catechism, with material added from the Deharbe catechisms. The scriptural references are from the new Confraternity revision of the New Testament. There are a few examples of faulty enumeration of paragraphs, probably due to additions or omissions from the first edition. But this is a very minor defect in what is a veritable treasury of doctrinal and illustrative material on the Apostles Creed. It is hoped that Dr. Baierl will follow up this book on the Creed with new editions of his useful works on the Commandments, the Sacraments, and Prayer. The Catechetical Guild of St. Paul is to be congratulated on giving us a well-printed and pleasing text.

JOSEPH C. COLLINS, S. S.

LIFE WITH THE HOLY GHOST. By Rev. Hugh Francis Blunt. The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis. 1943. Pp. xi + 130. $1.75.

Father Blunt is known to many as a poet, a lecturer, and a composer. His book "Life with the Holy Ghost" reveals him as a spiritual writer. The work is a complete treatise on the Holy Ghost, not, however, in the scholastic form preferred by theologians but in the popular style that appeals to the many. For this reason, Patristic and Scholastic sources are omitted. The author speaks of having compiled the book primarily for himself. In chapter IV, he adds: "I am writing about the Gifts of the Holy Ghost for myself and other ordinary people." It is the ordinary faithful of our own age that the author has in mind. He uses the most up-to-date ideas and expressions in order to explain eternal truths. He has succeeded in his purpose admirably. Written as it is in a very pleasant vein, his book is no less refreshing than instructive.

The first chapter—Prelude—is a synthesis of the fundamental Christian doctrine on the Trinity, Creation, Incarnation, Redemption, with special reference to the Holy Spirit and his work. In the second and third chapters, the authors treats of the Holy Ghost in us and of "His tools" namely, the infused cardinal virtues. The remaining eight chapters are devoted to the seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost.

The book is a welcome addition to our rather scanty literature on the Holy Ghost. The Catholic doctrine is rendered faithfully and clearly. There is, however, a passage on page 9 that is misleading and that creates a false notion of the nature of original sin: "Original sin can be called sin only in a broad sense so far as we are concerned, since there is no guilty action on our part." This interpretation of original sin—"so far as we are concerned"—is opposed to the doctrine of the Council of Trent, *Decretum super Peccato Originali*, 2. Sessio V.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

THE APOSTLE, A NOVEL BASED ON THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. By Sholem Asch, translated by Maurice Samuel. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1943. Pp. vii + 804. $3.00.

A more appropriate title, we think, for this novel would be *A Distortion Based on the Imagination of Sholem Asch.* The aberrations of the author are too numerous to mention in detail; suffice it to mention some of the more glaring among them. Most basic of all is that St. Paul is presented as the founder of the Christian Church! This contradicts the evidence of the best witnesses we have on the point, the Gospels, the Acts and St. Paul's own epistles. Mr. Asch makes abundant use of the apostle's writings, but shies away from those passages which he cannot fit in with his particular theory.

The next most serious misrepresentation given us by the wild imagination

of Mr. Asch is the picture of St. Paul. Far from finishing *The Apostle* with reverence and a deep sense of debt to Paul, as the jacket blurb promises, the understanding reader, who knows the apostle from the authentic accounts of his conversion and labors in the Acts, and from St. Paul's own revelation of his soul in his epistles, will experience a sense of revulsion and disgust at the monstrous picture drawn by Mr. Asch. He represents St. Paul as on the verge of insanity from the remorse experienced because of his fierce persecution of the Christians. The appearance of the risen Lord to St. Paul near Damascus is described in such a way as to suggest a purely natural occurrence, and in terms which might be used to describe an epileptic fit. After his conversion St. Paul still continues, according to Mr. Asch, in the throes of doubt and perplexity, from which he seeks escape by participating in the debauchery and intoxication of pagan worship. St. Paul is depicted as a man of fiery injustice, of sharp intolerance, who has nothing but scorn for his own people. How false such representations are, will be immediately recognized by anyone who is acquainted with the authentic records, namely the Acts and the Pauline epistles.

Another distortion, which leads us to suspect that Mr. Asch has more assiduously read the works of modern rationalists than he has the contemporary records, is that the early Christians, including, or rather because of the Apostles, looked for the speedy return of Jesus in power and glory. Another misrepresentation sets St. Paul at variance with Jesus in regard to the repeal of the Mosaic Law, and accordingly Paul directs St. Luke to correct the Gospel according to St. Matthew and to expunge all the passages not in accord with this repeal.

St. Paul, we know, was firmly convinced of the divinity of Jesus Christ, and says so directly or indirectly on almost every page of his epistles, but not once is he presented by Mr. Asch as unequivocally holding this basic tenet of the Christian religion. It is true that Jesus is frequently referred to as "the Son of God," but that the term, as used in this novel, is not to be taken literally becomes clear when we read, "The Apostle Paul begins to find his way back to God whom he had for a time lost because of his love for the Messiah"!

Mr. Asch and his translator have achieved a fine piece of writing as far as style and diction go. Greater is the pity that such fine power of expression has been prostituted and made the vehicle of such rot.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

THE HISTORIC MISSION OF JESUS. C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D. Litt., Oxon; M.A., D.D., London; Hon.D.D., Edinburgh; Vice-Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. Harper & Brothers, New York. Pp. xxiv + 376. $3.00.

The author of this book is a member of the over-crowded profession of biblical plastic surgeons. With critical scalpel in hand they excise large

portions from the Gospels, and from the mutilated remains proceed to build up their theories.

Dr. Cadoux practices the art with considerable abandon in this book. For example the interpretation of the parable of the sower is "probably ungenuine"; the disciples are "unhistorically represented" as saying to Jesus after stilling the storm, "Truly, thou art God's Son"; the injunction to baptize in Mt. 28, 19 is "almost certainly a creation of the early Church"; we may feel justified in doubting the Nature-miracles; "we may feel compelled to discredit the miracle" (of the loaves); beliefs in the corporeal resurrection of Jesus is "beset by intolerable intellectual burdens"; the stories of the empty tomb are not based on any satisfactory objective evidence; they are inferences from the visions of the risen Jesus, who, however, according to Dr. Cadoux, did not rise.

Dr. Cadoux has scant right to talk of objective evidence when he casually discards gospel passages and doctrines on grounds that are largely if not entirely subjective. It is mainly philosophical prepossessions and subjective interpretations of Jesus' words which lead the author to many of his positions. For example, "The modern Christian has come to the conclusion that neither Satan nor the demons actually existed"; the ascension of Jesus into heaven is "so hard to believe that nothing save the most unimpeachable evidence could justify one in believing it"; (Dr. Cadoux does not find the "unimpeachable evidence"); Jesus made mistakes, for example, in regard to eternal punishment and hell fire. Dr. Cadoux so opines because such a doctrine is irreconcilable with Jesus' teaching about the mercy of God (as interpreted by Dr. Cadoux). It is quite easy for Dr. Cadoux to admit that Jesus could contradict himself, but such inconsistencies cannot escape the alert mind of the modern critic. Dr. Cadoux thinks that the "modern Christian conscience has definitely given up belief" in the idea of eternal retribution. How, it may be asked, would Dr. Cadoux classify the consciences of millions of Catholics?

What are the conclusions the Doctor reaches? Jesus was "the Son of God in a unique sense," but in whatever sense He was the Son of God, that filiation did not prevent him from falling into some of the errors of his day, thinks Dr. Cadoux. In other words for the author of this book Jesus was a man, perhaps the greatest of all time, but still merely a man.

Isn't it strange that there is no manuscript evidence for the many later additions to the original Gospels which biblical surgeons discern and would remove by their literary appendectomies?

It is a great pity that at a time like this when the confused and bewildered world stands in such dire need of absolute truth, that such books as this have to be published to add yet more to the confusion and bewilderment of a distraught, war-weary world.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

SAINT VINCENT FERRIER. By Henri Ghéon. La Librairie Dominicaine, Montreal et Ottawa, 1943. Pp. 195. $1.00.

This *Life* of St. Vincent Ferrier (Ferrer: 1350–1419), by Henri Ghéon forms part of the Collection "Les Grands Coeurs" (of which to date 37 volumes have been published) edited under the direction of Mme. Marie Gasquet by F. Flammarion. M. Gheon has also written the Lives of the Cure D'Ars, Jean Bosco, and Thérèse de Liseux for this collection.

As a convert, a playwright, and as an author, Henri Ghéon is well known to all French *litterateurs* and to those English-speaking Catholics who have had the opportunity of reading his works in English translations. His style is vivacious, romantic, and at times dramatic. The exposition of his hero is clear-cut; the description of the epoch in which the saint lived is detailed; and the portrayal of the *dramatis personae* surrounding the protagonist true to character.

St. Vincent Ferrer had the distinction of adhering, during a long span of his life, to two anti-popes, Clement VII (Robert of Geneva) and Benedict XIII (the Spaniard, Peter de Luna), whose confessor he was. He was in good faith, assuredly. During the course of the Great Western Schism (1368–1417) no one knew for an absolute certainty just who of the three popes (the Roman, the Pisan, or the Avignonesian) was the true Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. Vincent Ferrer adhered to the popes of Avignon. The defense of his choice, however, is rather weak. But once the schism was over, St. Vincent Ferrer threw the full force of his allegiance to the legitimate pope, Martin V, elected at the Council of Constance in 1417.

The saint was one of the most renowned penitential preachers of the Middle Ages. His preaching tours in quest of souls brought him through the greater parts of Spain, Switzerland, and in the latter part of his life, France. He was opposed to the Anti-Semitic movement in the Spain of his day, seeking rather to convert Jews by bringing them into the Christian fold than to ostracize them because they refused to accept the Christian tenets of Faith. He died in the odor of sanctity an exile in France, where he is honored and revered as the Patron of Brittany.

M. Gheon writes in a popular style, with no attempt at documentation. The literature quoted, while covering the essentials, is listed without the places or years of publication and does not go beyond the works on St. Vincent published in French. The important literary studies of S. Brettle entitled *San Vincente Ferrer u. seine literarischer Nachlass* (Münster, 1925), supplementing Fages' *Histoire de Saint V. F.* and his *Les bases d'etude historique de saint V. F.*, and A. Sorbelli's *Il Trattato di St. Vincente altorno al grande schisma d'Occidente* (II ed. Bologne, 1905) should at least have been included. The volume has recently been translated into English.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER, O.F.M. Conv.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL. By William Foxwell Albright, Ph.D., Litt.D., D.H.L., Th.D. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore. 1942. Pp. xii + 238.

A work by Dr. Albright is always welcome, and this one is no exception. The present volume treats of matter related to that of his preceding book *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. The author, however, has seen to it that the two books do not overlap to any appreciable extent. The former book aimed to point out what new light archaeology throws on the culture of the ancient Near East; this one attempts to do the same for the religion of Israel.

The first chapter serves as a general introduction to the work. The author classifies man's mental processes as aesthetic and imaginative, affective, and conceptual and reasoning. He stresses, however, that two or three of them are generally brought into operation together. He seeks to illustrate these functions of the Near Eastern mind by drawing on literary documents, artistic remains, linguistic data, artifacts. In discussing man's reasoning powers he adopts Lévy-Bruhl's hypothesis of three successive stages of development—pre-logical, empirico-logical, logical.

He then deals with the written and unwritten sources for the religions of the ancient Near East—Syria and Palestine, Mesopotamia, Egypt and Ethiopia, Persia, Heth, Arabia, Cyprus and the Aegean—and with the way these sources should be employed (ch. II). In the next chapter he gives a sketch, not intended to be exhaustive, of Canaanite religion and practice, drawn chiefly from Ugaritic literature. Adaptations by Israel lie "almost entirely in the domain of religious architecture, cultic symbolism and sacrificial practice, poetic language and temple music" (p. 94).

The last two chapters call attention to the contribution of archaeological discoveries to our knowledge of the religion of Israel from the period of Conquest to the eve of the Exile. They also contain much material of a social, economic, and political nature for purposes of orientation.

Space does not permit a detailed examination of the many questions raised in this extremely interesting volume, and a summary discussion would be unsatisfactory and inadequate. The Old Testament student will certainly profit by the wealth of archaeological information the book contains, but it must be read with discrimination. Some of Dr. Albright's positions, such as those regarding the psychological classification for the study of the development of the human mind, and the Temple as primarily a royal chapel, are based on quite shaky foundations.

JOHN P. WEISENGOFF

PIUS XII ON WORLD PROBLEMS. By James W. Naughton, S.J. The America Press, New York City. 1943. Pp. xxiv + 199. $2.00.

This is a small but an important book. Father Naughton is an excellent editor, and practically the entire contents are excerpts from encyclicals,

allocutions, radio addresses and letters of the present Holy Father. He confines himself to citing introductory phrases and sentences, while the connecting links are principally paraphrases of the Pope in the same or related contexts.

The book is divided into four parts. First the sufferings of war are described, and the causes of war are shown to be Godlessness, materialism, totalitarianism, racism, international distrust, and social and economic inequalities. In the second part, the Pope's peace efforts and reconstruction plans are set forth. In this section Father Naughton presents the summary of the Pope's complete peace program as prepared by Rev. E. A. Conway, S.J. The third part is concerned with the State, marriage, education and the social question. The conclusion considers the Church of today. There is a good index and a short bibliography.

The classifications are well considered and on the whole excellently carried out. The book will be a worth-while addition to the rectory library and should also be of value to study clubs.

CATHOLIC PITTSBURGH'S ONE HUNDRED YEARS. Published under the patronage of Most Reverend Hugh C. Boyle, D.D. Loyola University Press, Chicago. 1943. Pp. xvi + 271. Illus.

This symposium, celebrating the centenary of the founding of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, was prepared by the Catholic Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania.

The book is divided into two parts. The first seven chapters cover the early Catholicity in Western Pennsylvania and the lives and policies of the six bishops of Pittsburgh. Part II devotes eleven chapters to the growth of the Diocese, significant movements and Catholic activities. Chapters are devoted to Catholic education, the Holy Name Society, the lay retreat movement, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, women's organizations, charities and architecture. An appendix contains a directory of the diocese. A fair bibliography and a good index add to the value of the book.

As a commemorative volume, this book is popular in content and style. Written for the general reader, and especially the laity of Pittsburgh, it nevertheless has value for the church historian and the student. Dr. Paul E. Campbell and his Historical Society are to be congratulated upon having produced, in these troublous times, such a worthwhile contribution.

Book Notes

Father Maurice Kennedy's *Parochial Mass and Announcement Book for 1944* removes the danger of conflicting weddings, funerals and Masses, of forgetting to announce banns, collections and other parish activities. The arrangement is excellent. Two facing pages are allotted to each week. On one page the announced Masses are inscribed with place for the name of the person ordering the Mass and the priest who satisfied the obligation. The opposite page lists the weddings (time, names, officiating priest, time of rehearsal, music, flowers, amount and to whom stole fee was given); funerals (time, name, officers of the Mass, cemetery, place of wake, amount and to whom stipend was paid); devotions; meetings and activities; collections; banns, and a place for miscellaneous announcements. Our suggestions for the 1945 edition would be: loose-leaf binding to allow use of typewriter; more space allowed for writing in the banns and the dead and sick of the parish who are to be prayed for. (Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. $2.50.)

The Eternal City is a book of photographs of Vatican City and papal Rome, which, with the accompanying text, give the reader a splendid knowledge of the varied activities and priceless treasures of the center of Catholicism. The text is adequate, but the photography is outstanding. Mr. Desider Holisher is a man of imagination and sound artistry, and his work in Italy before the war gave him opportunities that come to few men in his field. *The Eternal City* is technically excellent and inspiring because of its content. This is a book that those who have been in Rome will want because of the happy memories it will revive, and which those who hope to visit Rome will enjoy because of the happy promises it holds forth. (Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York. 1943. Pp. 160. $3.00.)

Two Basic Social Encyclicals, published by The Catholic University of America and distributed through Benziger Brothers, Inc., New York City, contains the *Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leo XIII and the *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pope Pius XI in the original Latin and a new English translation. This translation was prepared by the University's School of Social Science, and in a letter to the late Bishop Joseph Corrigan, the Apostolic Delegate, Most Rev. Amleto Cicognani certified that the translations are to be regarded as authorized by the Holy See. The Latin and English texts are set on facing pages in 12 point, clear type. It is a text that the pastor as well as the student will find very helpful.

An excellent mission story is *White Fire* by Rev. E. J. Edwards S.V.D. It tells in authentic language and description the work of an American community among Philippine lepers. How a leprosarium is conducted and the treatment of lepers is fully shown during the course of the story. Father Edwards writes simply and directly, yet manages

to show the misery of the lepers and the genuine self-sacrifice of the Sisters. Love of God and the power of prayer make it possible for the missionary to live a full life. The dramatic possibilities of our missionaries have not been realized by Catholic writers. It is to be hoped that an adequate sale of this book will encourage the publication of other mission stories. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. 1943. Pp. III + 219. $2.75.)

An American edition is now ready of Monsignor Luigi Civardi's *A Manual of Catholic Action*, translated by Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. (Sheed & Ward, New York 3, N. Y. 1943. Pp. xviii + 266. $2.75.) The translation is from the seventh Italian edition. Monsignor Civardi has made a careful study and the book is thoroughly documented. The Papal pronouncements are set out in their entirety. In the first part, "Catholic Action in Itself," are studied the idea, the ends, the apostolate, the necessity of Catholic Action, and the system of its organization. Part II, "Catholic Action, in its Various Relationships," considers Catholic Action and the hierarchy, the clergy and politics, social-economic works and its auxiliary works. This orderly presentation of the fundamental principles on which Catholic Action is founded and the practical rules suggested will do much to remove the misconceptions that have surrounded Catholic Action.

The Missing Value in Medical Social Case Work by Claire Peugnet, and the promised volumes of the St. Louis School of Social Service aim to present the Catholic viewpoint and the necessity of morality and religion in rehabilitating "human beings in search of values." Miss Peugnet presents her case capably, and she illustrates by well-selected quotations from the writings of prominent social workers. It is a book that Catholic social workers must read, that non-Catholic workers should, but probably will not read. (St. Louis University Press, St. Louis, Mo. Pp. 115. $1.50.)

The fourth and final volume of Father Nicholas O'Rafferty's *Instructions* on Christian Doctrine is now ready for distribution. It covers prayer, the precepts of the Church, the virtues and sin. With the other three volumes it is a complete course.

While Father O'Rafferty has based his *Instructions* on Fra Ildephonsus Bressanvido's work, he has drawn on other standard authors and added original features. Of practical value to the parish priest are the adaptations of the instructions to the Gospels for Sundays and Holydays indicating the material especially appropriate for sermons and instructions on these days. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. 1943. Pp. viii + 300. $3.25.)

Books Received

ORESTES BROWNSON, YANKEE, RADICAL, CATHOLIC. By Theodore Maynard. New York. Macmillan. 1943. Pp. xvi + 456. $3.00.

THE TEXT OF THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES OF ST. IGNATIUS. Translated from the Original Spanish. Fourth Edition, Revised, Westminster, Maryland. The Newman Bookshop. 1943. Pp. xii + 125. $1.25.

THE SPIRITUAL CONFERENCES. By St. Francis de Sales. Translated from the Annecy Text of 1895 under the supervision of Abbot Gasquet and the late Canon Mackey, O.S.B. Westminster, Maryland. The Newman Bookshop. 1943. Pp. lxii + 406. $2.75.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN AND NATURAL LAW. By Jacques Maritain. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1943. Pp. 119. $1.25.

PHILOSOPHIES AT WAR. By Fulton J. Sheen. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1943. Pp. 200. $2.00.

THE SCREWTAPE LETTERS. By C. S. Lewis. New York. Macmillan. 1943. Eighth Printing. Pp. 160. $1.50.

MEN OF MARYKNOLL. By James Keller and Meyer Berger. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1943. Pp. 191. $2.00.

COMMENTARIUS IN SUMMAM D. THOMAE—DE DEO UNO ET TRINO. By Auguste Ferland, S.S. Montreal. The Grand Seminary. Pp. xx + 451. $2.50.

A HANDY GUIDE FOR WRITERS. By Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D. St. Louis, Mo. B. Herder Book Co. 1943. Pp. 248. $2.00.

A PRIMER OF HOMILETICS. By Reverend Thomas A. Carney, M.A., K.H.S. Dickinson, Texas. "Sodality Distributors," Shrine of the True Cross. 1943. Pp. 143 + Foreword, Preface and Index. $2.50.

THE CAPTAIN WEARS A CROSS. By William A. Maguire, Captain (Ch C), U.S.N. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1943. Pp. xiii + 207. $2.00.

FROM A MORNING PRAYER. By John M. Haffert. New York. The Scapular Press. 1943. Pp. xiii + 151. $2.00.

GOD'S GUESTS OF TOMORROW. By L. M. Dooley, S.V.D. New York. The Scapular Press. 1943. Pp. 111. $1.75.

THE LATE GREEK OPTATIVE AND ITS USE IN THE WRITINGS OF GREGORY NAZIANZEN. By Sister Rose de Lima Henry. Washington. The Catholic University of America Press. 1943. Pp. xx + 108. $2.00.

PHILOSOPHIE DE LANGAGE. By Louise Lachance. Ottawa and Montreal. Les Editions du Levrier. 1943. Pp. 216. $1.50.

THE LEONARD FEENEY OMNIBUS. New York. Sheed and Ward. 1943. Pp. xiv + 399. $3.00.

A COMPANION TO SCRIPTURE STUDIES. Vol. III. Special Introduction to The New Testament. By Reverend John E. Steinmueller, ST.D., S.S.L. Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. 1943. Pp. ix + 409. $3.75.

ACTES DU PREMIER CONGRES NATIONAL DE L'UNION MISSIONNAIRE DU CLERGÉ AU CANADA. September 22–24, 1943 at Montreal. Conseil National de l'Union Missionnaire du Clergé. Quebec. 1943. Pp. 209. $1.65.

CATHOLIC EVIDENCE TRAINING OUTLINES. By Maisie Ward and F. J. Sheed. Sheed & Ward, New York City. 1943. Pp. 362. $2.50.

SOUL OF RUSSIA. By Helen Iswolsky. Sheed & Ward, New York City. 1943. Pp. xiii + 200. $2.75.

PRAYER AND INTELLIGENCE. By Jacques Maritain. Sheed & Ward, New York City. 1943. Pp. xi + 56. $1.00.

SAINT CHARLES SEMINARY OVERBROOK. By Reverend George E. O'Donnell. Jefferies & Manz, Philadelphia 6, Pa. 1943. Pp. ix + 401. Illustrated $3.00.

THE SINGLE WOMAN. By Ruth Reed. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1942. Pp. xiv + 227. $2.00.

HOLY HOUR. By Reverend Mateo Crawley-Boevey, SS.CC. National Center of the Enthronement, Fairhaven, Mass. 1943. Pp. 692. $3.00.

THE UNIVOCITY OF THE CONCEPT OF BEING IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF JOHN DUNS SCOTUS. By Reverend Cyril Shircel, O.F.M. Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C. 1942. Pp. 188.

PAMPHLETS

THE RACE OF MANKIND. By Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish. Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York. 1943. Pp. 31. Price 10¢.

LATIN AMERICA PATTERN. By Rev. J. A. Magner. Catholic Students Mission Crusade, Cincinnati. Pp. v + 98. Price 88¢.

A DECLARATION ON PEACE AND RECONSTRUCTION. Central Bureau Press, St. Louis 8, Mo. 1943. Pp. 31.

SAINTHOOD THE UNIVERSAL VOCATION. By Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ambrose J. Burke. Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Indiana. Pp. 14. Price 15¢.

THE PATH OF DUTY. By Reverend John F. Cronin. Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind. 1943. Pp. 32. Price, 15¢.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF ST. COLUMBAN'S MISSIONS. Jubilee Issue of The Far East, St. Columbans, Neb. Pp. 25.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London, S. W. 1.: *The Truth of Scripture* by Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. Pp. 24. *Pius XII On The Rights of Man* by Canon George Smith. Pp. 21. *Marrying A Catholic* by Msgr. P. E. Hallett. Pp. 24. *The Expectant Mother Looks at Life* by Mrs. Blundell of Crosby.